

Genealogical constructions of population models

Alison M. Etheridge *

Department of Statistics
Oxford University

Oxford

UK

etheridg@stats.ox.ac.uk

Thomas G. Kurtz †

Departments of Mathematics and Statistics

University of Wisconsin - Madison

480 Lincoln Drive

Madison, WI 53706-1388

USA

kurtz@math.wisc.edu

<http://www.math.wisc.edu/~kurtz/>

February 15, 2014

Abstract

Representations of population models in terms of countable systems of particles are constructed, in which each particle has a ‘type’, typically recording both spatial position and genetic type, and a level. For finite intensity models, the levels are distributed on $[0, \lambda]$, whereas in the infinite intensity limit, at each time t , the joint distribution of types and levels is conditionally Poisson, with mean measure $\Xi(t) \times l$ where l denotes Lebesgue measure and $\Xi(t)$ is a measure-valued population process. Key forces of ecology and genetics can be captured within this common framework. Models covered incorporate both individual and event based births and deaths, one-for-one replacement, immigration, independent ‘thinning’ and independent or exchangeable spatial motion and mutation of individuals. Since birth and death probabilities can depend on type, they also include natural selection.

Key words: population model, Moran model, lookdown construction, genealogies, voter model, generators, stochastic equations, Lambda Fleming-Viot process, stepping stone model

MSC 2010 Subject Classification: Primary: 60J25, 92D10, 92D15, 92D25 92D40
Secondary: 60F05, 60G09, 60G55, 60G57, 60H15, 60J68

1 Introduction

1.1 Background

There is now a vast mathematical literature devoted to modeling the dynamics of biological populations. The models employed generally fall into one of two classes: ecological models,

*Research supported in part by EPSRC grants EP/I01361X and EP/K034316/1

†Research supported in part by NSF grant DMS 11-06424

that aim to elucidate the interactions within and between populations, and between those populations and the environment; and models of population genetics, that aim to explain the patterns of genetic variation observed in samples from a population. Ecological models typically take into account (some of) spatial structure, competition for resources, predator-prey interactions and changing environmental conditions. Often they assume infinite populations, allowing one to concentrate on fluctuations in growth rates and ignore demographic stochasticity. Models from population genetics, by contrast, often concentrate on the demographic stochasticity (known in that context as random genetic drift) which arises from the randomness due to reproduction in a finite population and assume that the population from which one is sampling is *panmictic* (that is there are no group structures or mating restrictions) and of constant size. The ‘size’ however, is not taken to be the census population size, but rather an *effective* population size, which is intended to capture the effects of things like varying population size and spatial structure. In particular, the underlying ecology is supposed to be encapsulated in this single parameter. This strategy has been surprisingly effective, but in most situations, notably when the population is geographically dispersed, the influence of different evolutionary and ecological forces on the value of the effective population size remains unresolved. To address these effects one must combine ecological and genetical models.

Whereas in ecological models one usually asks about the existence of equilibria or the probability that a species can invade new territory, in population genetics, data on the differences between genes sampled from a finite number of individuals in the population is used to infer the ‘genealogical trees’ that relate those genes, and so from a practical point of view it is the distribution of these trees that one would like to describe. As a result, we require a framework for modeling populations which allows one to combine ecology and genetics in such a way that the genealogical trees relating individuals in a sample from the population are retained. Our goal in this paper is to provide just such a framework.

Mathematical population genetics is concerned with models that capture, for large populations, the key forces of evolution that are acting on the population, but which are robust to changes in the fine detail of local reproduction mechanisms. Diffusion limits lie at the heart of the theory. The prototypical example is the Wright-Fisher diffusion which arises as an approximation to the dynamics of allele frequencies in large panmictic populations of neutral genes whose dynamics can be governed by a plethora of different models. In this situation, the genealogical trees relating individuals in a sample are approximated by Kingman’s coalescent, in which each pair of ancestral lineages coalesces into a common ancestor at a rate inversely proportional to the effective population size. Naïvely one obtains the Kingman coalescent as a ‘moment dual’ to the diffusion. However, this is not sufficient to guarantee that it really approximates the genealogy of a sample from one of the individual based models. Indeed, there are examples of systems of individual based models for which the allele frequencies are approximated by a common diffusion, but for which the genealogical trees relating individuals in a sample from the limiting populations have *different* distributions [15]. Whereas the structure of the genealogical trees is usually implicit in the description of individual based models, in the diffusion limit the individuals have disappeared and with them their genealogies. Our approach allows us to retain information about the genealogies as we pass to the limit.

The framework that we shall present here is very general. It will allow us to construct

population models that capture the key ecological forces shaping the population as well as demographic stochasticity. Many ‘classical’ examples will emerge as special cases. We shall use it to pass from individual based models to continuous approximations, but while retaining information about the way in which individuals in a random sample from the population are related to one another. In particular, we shall fulfill one of our primary aims when we began this project, by constructing the spatial Λ -Fleming-Viot process (that was introduced in [1, 7]) as a high-density limit of a class of individual based models that generalize those considered by [2]. We also present a different construction, equivalent in the high-density limit to that of [16], but requiring somewhat weaker conditions.

1.2 Approach

Our approach belongs to the family of ‘lookdown constructions’. Building on the ideas of [4] and [5], a number of authors have developed constructions of population models that incorporate information about genealogical relationships. These constructions typically involve assigning each individual in the population to a (non-negative) integer or real-valued ‘level’, with connections between the levels determining the genealogical trees. They are generically referred to as ‘lookdown’ constructions since, in most cases, during reproduction events, offspring inserted at a given level ‘look down’ to individuals at lower levels to determine their parent.

Lookdown constructions are simplest if the spatial locations or types of individuals in the population do not affect the reproductive dynamics. In that setting, the ‘levels’ can be taken to be fixed. We illustrate the key idea for the simple example originally considered by [4]. Consider a population of constant size N . Individuals are assigned levels $1, \dots, N$ by choosing uniformly at random among all possible assignments. The dynamics are as follows: we attach an independent Poisson process $\pi_{(i,j)}$, of rate λ , to each pair (i, j) of levels. At a point of $\pi_{(i,j)}$, the individual with the higher of the two levels i and j dies and is replaced by a copy of the individual with the lower level. In between these replacement events, individuals (independently) accumulate mutations. Since the level of an individual has such a strong impact on its evolution, it is not at all obvious that this description gives rise to a sensible population model. The key to seeing that it does is that the generator of the process preserves exchangeability among levels. More precisely, denote the type of the individual at level i by $X_i(t)$. It is not hard to check that if $(X_1(0), \dots, X_N(0))$ is exchangeable (that is, has the same distribution as $(X_{\sigma(1)}(0), \dots, X_{\sigma(N)}(0))$ for any permutation of $\{1, \dots, N\}$), then so is $(X_1(t), \dots, X_N(t))$ for all $t > 0$. As a result, if we assign labels uniformly at random at time zero, the distribution of types in the population is determined by the empirical measure $Z_N(t) = \sum_{i=1}^N X_i(t)/N$ and this can be identified by writing out the generator of the full process $(X_1(t), \dots, X_N(t))$ on symmetric functions $f(x_1, \dots, x_N)$ and using that for such a function

$$f(x_1, \dots, x_N) = \frac{1}{n!} \sum_{\sigma} f(x_{\sigma(1)}, \dots, x_{\sigma(N)}),$$

where the sum is over all permutations of $\{1, \dots, N\}$. In other words, we *average out* over the (uniform) distribution of the assignment of individuals to levels. This yields the generator of the neutral Moran model, which has the same dynamics as the model above, except that

when the clock $\pi_{(i,j)}$ rings, it is equally likely to be the individual at either level which dies. It is also a simple matter to see that the genealogical trees relating individuals in the population are governed by the Kingman coalescent, just as for the Moran model. In other words, our model is really just the classical Moran model, but augmented with a very particular labeling of the individuals in the population. A nice property of this labeling, is that the model for a population of size N is embedded in that for a population of size $N + k$ for $k \geq 1$ and so it is straightforward to identify what will happen in the limit as $N \rightarrow \infty$. Passing to the limit corresponds to taking the diffusion approximation for the unlabeled population. The de Finetti Theorem guarantees that the empirical distribution $Z_N(t)$ converges and it must converge to the same limit as that of the Moran model (namely the Fleming-Viot diffusion). Meanwhile, the genealogy of a sample of size n does not change as we increase the population size since, by construction, it is determined by looking at the lowest n levels.

In order to extend the lockdown construction to the setting in which the locations or types of individuals in the population affect their reproductive dynamics, [10] introduced the idea of taking random levels. More precisely, writing E for the space in which the population evolves, conditional on the empirical measure of the population configuration being $K(t)$ at time t , ‘individuals’ are assigned types and levels according to a Poisson distribution on $E \times [0, \infty)$ with mean measure $K(t) \times \ell$, where ℓ is Lebesgue measure. If we ‘average out’ over the distribution of the levels we recover $K(t)$. Under appropriate conditions, the most important of which is that the generator governing the dynamics of the labeled population respects the conditionally Poisson structure (the analogue of the exchangeability in the case of fixed levels), a Markov mapping theorem, Theorem A.2, allows us to conclude that by ‘removing the levels’ we recover the Markov process whose generator is obtained through this process of averaging. In particular, existence of a solution to the martingale problem for the unlabeled population process is enough to guarantee existence of a solution to the martingale problem for the labeled population, from which a solution to that for the unlabeled population can be read off by averaging. Moreover, uniqueness of the solution of the labeled martingale problem guarantees that of the solution to the unlabeled martingale problem. In [10], this approach was used to construct measure-valued population models with spatially dependent birth and death rates: for a given spatial location, offspring can be inserted at rates that depend on the local configuration without destroying the conditionally Poisson structure. Poisson levels have been used extensively since (e.g. [3, 6, 8, 16]). In [12], levels are again conditionally Poisson, but now they are allowed to evolve continuously with time, a device which we shall also exploit here.

Our approach in this article will be to define population models in which individuals are assigned levels, to average out over those levels in order to identify the unlabeled population model, and to pass to an infinite population limit. Justification of this approach to constructing the unlabeled population model is based upon filtering arguments, that is, the “averaging out” corresponds to conditioning on all information about the past of the process *except* the levels of the particles. Ensuring the validity of this conditioning arguments requires that the assignment of individuals to levels be done in such a way that past observations of the distribution of spatial positions and genetic types does not give any information about the current levels of individuals in the population. It is important to realize that such assignments are far from unique. For example, in §3.1 we provide three possible ways for levels to evolve in a simple pure death process and in §4.1, we give two different particle

constructions of the spatial Λ -Fleming-Viot process.

1.3 Structure of paper

The rest of the paper is laid out as follows. In §2 we lay out the notation that we need for our discrete and continuous population models and for the ‘averaging’ operations that we apply when we use the Markov mapping theorem. In order to construct our general models, we exploit the fact that sums of generators are typically generators and so we can break our models apart into component pieces. In §3, we examine each of these components in turn. In §4, we draw these together into a collection of familiar, and not so familiar, examples. For convenience, some useful identities for Poisson random measures are gathered together in Appendix A.1, and the Markov mapping theorem is stated in Appendix A.2.

We need to emphasize that §3 contains calculations, not proofs. These calculations give the first step in the application of the Markov mapping theorem, Theorem A.2, which ensures that the lookdown constructions actually represent the desired processes, but additional details should be checked for particular applications. In addition, the discrete particle models, indexed by $\lambda > 0$, should converge to measure-valued models as $\lambda \rightarrow \infty$. For many of the models, convergence of the lookdown constructions is obvious while in other cases, convergence follows easily by standard generator/martingale problem arguments. It is then useful to know that convergence of the lookdown constructions implies convergence of the corresponding measure-valued processes. Appendices A.2 and A.3 of [12] provide the results needed to verify this convergence.

The results given in §4 are intended to be rigorous unless otherwise indicated.

2 Notation

We will consider continuous-time, time-homogeneous, Markov models specified by their generators. Each individual will have a *type* chosen from a complete separable metric space (E, d) . We emphasize that here we are using ‘type’ as shorthand for both spatial location and genetic type. In addition, each individual will be assigned a ‘level’ which in the discrete case will be sampled from an interval $[0, \lambda]$ and in the continuous case from $[0, \infty)$.

A state of one of our discrete population models will be of the form $\eta = \sum \delta_{(x,u)}$, where $(x, u) \in E \times [0, \lambda]$. We shall abuse notation and treat η both as a set and a counting measure, with the understanding that multiple points are treated as distinct individuals. In other words

$$\sum_{(x,u) \in \eta} g(x, u) = \int g(x, u) \eta(dx, du) \text{ and } \prod_{(x,u) \in \eta} g(x, u) = \exp\left\{ \int \log g(x, u) \eta(dx, du) \right\}.$$

The projection of η on E will be denoted $\bar{\eta} = \sum_{(x,u) \in \eta} \delta_x$ and η will have the property that conditional on $\bar{\eta}$, the levels of the individuals in the population are independent uniform random variables on $[0, \lambda]$. It will be crucial that this conditioning property be preserved by the transformations of η induced by the components in our generator. Notice that allocating levels as independent uniform random variables is the natural continuous analogue of the way in which we allocated discrete levels through a uniform random sample from all possible

permutations. We shall write $\alpha(\bar{\eta}, \cdot)$ for the joint distribution of independent uniform $[0, \lambda]$ random variables U_x indexed by the points $x \in \bar{\eta}$. If f is a function of the U_x , then αf will denote the corresponding expectation.

Under appropriate conditions (see examples in §4) we can pass from the discrete population models to an infinite density limit. The resulting continuous population models arise as limits of states η_λ under assumptions that imply $\lambda^{-1}\eta_\lambda(\cdot, [0, \lambda])$ converges (at least in distribution) to a (possibly random) measure Ξ on E . This is the analogue of convergence of the empirical distribution in the simple case of a fixed number of discrete levels described in §1.2. Since we require that the levels in η_λ be conditionally independent uniform random variables given $\bar{\eta}_\lambda$, it follows that η_∞ , the limit of the η_λ , will be a counting measure on $E \times [0, \infty)$ that is conditionally Poisson with Cox measure $\Xi \times \ell$, ℓ being Lebesgue measure. That is, for example,

$$E[e^{-\int_{E \times [0, \infty)} f(x, u) \eta(dx, du)} | \Xi] = e^{-\int_E \int_0^\infty (1 - e^{-f(x, u)}) du \Xi(dx)}.$$

To mirror our notation in the discrete setting, in the continuous case, $\alpha(\Xi, \cdot)$ will denote the distribution of a conditionally Poisson random measure η on $E \times [0, \infty)$ with mean measure $\Xi(dx) \times \ell$.

To describe the generators of our population models, we take the domain to consist of functions of the form

$$f(\eta) = \prod_{(x, u) \in \eta} g(x, u) = \exp\left\{\int \log g(x, u) \eta(dx, du)\right\},$$

where g is continuous and differentiable in u and $0 \leq g \leq 1$. The function g may be required to satisfy other conditions, but the collection of g employed will be large enough to ensure that the domain is separating. In what follows, we will frequently write expressions in which $f(\eta)$ is multiplied by one or more factors of the form $1/g(x, u)$. It should be understood that if $g(x, u) = 0$, it simply cancels the corresponding factor in $f(\eta)$.

In the discrete case, if a transformation moves the level of an individual above λ , then the individual dies. We therefore impose the condition $g(x, u) = 1$ if $u \geq \lambda$. In this case $\alpha f(\bar{\eta}) = \prod_{x \in \bar{\eta}} \bar{g}(x)$, where $\bar{g}(x) = \lambda^{-1} \int_0^\lambda g(x, u) du$.

In the continuous case, we assume that there exists some u_g such that $g(x, u) = 1$ for $u \geq u_g$. Consequently, $h(x) = \int_0^\infty (1 - g(x, u)) du$ exists and we have

$$\alpha f(\Xi) = e^{-\int_E \int_0^\infty (1 - g(x, u)) du \Xi(dx)} = e^{-\int_E h(x) \Xi(dx)}.$$

3 Components of our generators

Having established our notation, we now turn to the building blocks of our population models. By combining these components, we will be able to consider models which incorporate a wide range of reproduction mechanisms.

3.1 Pure death process

In this subsection we introduce a component which, when we average over levels, corresponds to each individual in the population, independently, dying at an instantaneous rate $d_0(x) \geq 0$

which may depend on its type, x . We reiterate that x encodes both spatial position and genetic type. In particular, we do not require the population to be selectively neutral.

We assume that the level of an individual of type x evolves according to the differential equation $\dot{u} = d_0(x)u$. The individual will be killed when its level first reaches λ . Note that since the initial level $u(0)$ of an individual must be uniformly distributed on $[0, \lambda]$, if nothing else affects the level, the lifetime of the individual (that is the time τ until the level hits λ) is exponentially distributed,

$$P\{\tau > t\} = P\{u(0)e^{d_0(x)t} < \lambda\} = P\{u(0) < \lambda e^{-d_0(x)t}\} = e^{-d_0(x)t},$$

and conditional on $\{\tau > t\} = \{u(0)e^{d_0(x)t} < \lambda\}$, $u(0)e^{d_0(x)t}$ is uniformly distributed on $[0, \lambda]$.

The generator of this process is

$$A_{pd}f(\eta) = \int_{E \times [0, \lambda]} f(\eta) d_0(x) u \frac{\partial_u g(x, u)}{g(x, u)} \eta(dx, du).$$

Observing that

$$\lambda^{-1} \int_0^\lambda u \partial_u g(x, u) du = \lambda^{-1} u(g(x, u) - 1) \Big|_0^\lambda - \lambda^{-1} \int_0^\lambda (g(x, u) - 1) du = 1 - \bar{g}(x),$$

we see

$$\alpha A_{pd}f(\bar{\eta}) = \int_E \alpha f(\bar{\eta}) d_0(x) \left(\frac{1}{\bar{g}(x)} - 1 \right) \bar{\eta}(dx), \quad (3.1)$$

so that in this case, the projected population model is indeed just a pure death process in which the death rates may depend on the types of the individuals.

Other choices of the dynamics of the process with levels would have projected onto the same population model on averaging out the levels. For example, we could equally have obtained (3.1) by starting with

$$\tilde{A}_{pd}f(\eta) = \int_{E \times [0, \lambda]} f(\eta) d_0(x) \left(\frac{1}{g(x, u)} - 1 \right) \eta(dx, du)$$

(the levels don't move; the particles just disappear) or

$$\hat{A}_{pd}f(\eta) = \int_{E \times [0, \lambda]} f(\eta) d_0(x) \left(\frac{\lambda^2}{2} - \frac{u^2}{2} \right) \frac{\partial_u^2 g(x, u)}{g(x, u)} \eta(dx, du)$$

for g such that $\partial_u g(x, u)|_{u=0} = 0$ (the levels diffuse and absorb at λ).

For the continuous population limit,

$$A_{pd}f(\eta) = \int_{E \times [0, \infty)} f(\eta) d_0(x) u \frac{\partial_u g(x, u)}{g(x, u)} \eta(dx, du),$$

and defining $h(x) = \int_0^\infty (1 - g(x, u)) du$, with reference to Lemma A.1,

$$\begin{aligned} \alpha A_{pd}f(\Xi) &= \int_E \int_0^\infty d_0(x) u \partial_u g(x, u) du \Xi(dx) \alpha f(\Xi) \\ &= \int_E d_0(x) h(x) \Xi(dx) \alpha f(\Xi), \end{aligned} \quad (3.2)$$

where $\alpha f(\Xi) = e^{-\int_E h(x) \Xi(dx)}$. Note that αA_{pd} is the generator corresponding to the evolution of Ξ given by $\Xi_t(dx) = e^{-d_0(x)t} \Xi_0(dx)$.

3.2 Multiple deaths

Whereas in the pure death process of the previous subsection, individuals are removed from the population one at a time, we now turn to a model that allows for multiple simultaneous deaths. Moreover, in place of individual based death rates, deaths in the population will be driven by a series of ‘events’. An important distinction here is that whereas in A_{pd} levels evolve continuously in time, in this subsection they evolve through a series of jumps.

We parametrize the multiple death events by points from some abstract space $\mathbb{U}_d$. Corresponding to each $z \in \mathbb{U}_d$ is a pair $(k_d(z), d_1(\cdot, z))$, where $k_d(z)$ is an integer and $d_1(\cdot, z)$ is a nonnegative function on E , which allows us to weight each individual’s relative probability of death during an event according to its type and spatial position. We shall focus on the case in which events happen with intensity determined by a measure μ_d on $\mathbb{U}_d$, but exactly the same approach applies if we demand that the events occur at discrete times.

For a given pair $(k, d_1(\cdot))$, let

$$\tau(k, d_1, \eta) = \inf\{v : \eta\{(x, u) : e^{vd_1(x)}u \geq \lambda\} \geq k\},$$

where the infimum of an empty set is infinite. After the death event, the configuration becomes

$$\theta_{k, d_1} \eta \equiv \{(x, e^{\tau(k, d_1, \eta)d_1(x)}u) : (x, u) \in \eta \text{ and } e^{\tau(k, d_1, \eta)d_1(x)}u < \lambda\}.$$

Note that k individuals will die if $\eta(\{(x, u) : d_1(x) > 0\}) \geq k$. Otherwise, all individuals in $\{(x, u) : d_1(x) > 0\}$ are killed.

The generator for the model in which discrete death events occur with intensity $\mu_d(dz)$ then takes the form

$$A_{md}f(\eta) = \int_{\mathbb{U}_d} \left(\prod_{(x, u) \in \eta} g(x, ue^{\tau(k_d(z), d_1(\cdot, z), \eta)d_1(x, z)}) - f(\eta) \right) \mu_d(dz).$$

The fact that $\tau_{x, z}$ given by $U_x e^{d_1(x, z)\tau_{x, z}} = \lambda$ is exponential with parameter $d_1(x, z)$ and the $\tau_{x, z}$ are independent implies

$$\alpha A_{md}f(\bar{\eta}) = \int_{\mathbb{U}_d} \sum_{S \subset \bar{\eta}, |S|=k_d(z)} d(S, z) \alpha f(\bar{\eta}) \left(\frac{1}{\prod_{x \in S} \bar{g}(x)} - 1 \right) \mu_d(z),$$

where

$$d(S, z) = P\{\max_{x \in S} \tau_{x, z} < \min_{x \in \bar{\eta} \setminus S} \tau_{x, z}\}.$$

If $S = \{x\}$, then

$$d(S, z) = \frac{d_1(x, z)}{\int_E d_1(y, z) \bar{\eta}(dy)},$$

and if $d_1(x, z) = \zeta_z \mathbf{1}_{C_z}(x)$ and $S \subset C_z$, then

$$d(S, z) = \zeta_z^{|S|} (1 - \zeta_z)^{\bar{\eta}(C_z) - |S|}.$$

Many interesting high density limits require a balance between birth and death events. However, we close this subsection with a high density limit for the discrete death process

above when there are no balancing births. Suppose that $\lambda^{-1}\bar{\eta}_\lambda \rightarrow \Xi$ as $\lambda \rightarrow \infty$. At an event of type $z \in \mathbb{U}_d$,

$$P\{\tau(k_d(z), d_1(\cdot, z), \eta_\lambda) > \lambda^{-1}c\} = P\{\eta_\lambda\{(x, u) : e^{cd_1(x, z)/\lambda}u \geq \lambda\} < k_d(z)\}.$$

Now since, conditional on $\bar{\eta}_\lambda$, the levels u are independent uniform random variables on $[0, \lambda]$, for a single $(x, u) \in \eta_\lambda$, the probability that $u \geq \lambda e^{-cd_1(x, z)/\lambda}$ is $1 - e^{-cd_1(x, z)/\lambda}$ and the events $\{u \geq \lambda e^{-cd_1(x, z)/\lambda}\}$ are independent. Consequently, a Poisson approximation argument implies that $P\{\tau(k_d(z), d_1(\cdot, z), \eta_\lambda) > \lambda^{-1}c\}$ converges to $P\{Z < k_d(z)\}$ where, conditional on Ξ , Z is Poisson distributed with parameter $\int cd_1(x, z)\Xi(dx)$.

Consider the motion of a single level. The jumps (of size $(e^{\tau(k_d(z), d_1(\cdot, z), \eta_\lambda)d_1(x, z)} - 1)u$) that it experiences whenever a death event falls are independent (by lack of memory of the exponential distribution) and so if we speed up time by λ and apply the law of large numbers, we see that, in the limit as $\lambda \rightarrow \infty$, the motion of a single level converges to

$$\dot{u} = \int_{\mathbb{U}_d} \frac{k_d(z)}{\theta(z, \Xi(t))} d_1(x, z) \mu_d(dz) u,$$

where $\theta(z, \Xi) = \int d_1(x, z)\Xi(dx)$ and the limit of λA is

$$A_{md}^\infty f(\eta) = \int_{\mathbb{U}_d} f(\eta) \int \frac{k_d(z)}{\theta(z, \Xi)} d_1(x, z) u \frac{\partial g(x, u)}{g(x, u)} \eta(dx, du) \mu_d(dz).$$

Integrating the limiting form of the generator by parts, exactly as we did to obtain (3.2), yields

$$\alpha A_{md} f(\Xi) = \int_{\mathbb{U}_d} \int_E \frac{k_d(z) d_1(x, z) h(x)}{\theta(z, \Xi)} \Xi(dx) \alpha f(\Xi) \mu_d(z).$$

Note that there is a time change relative to the generator (3.2) even in the case when $k_d(z) \equiv 1$ and $d_1(x, z) \equiv d_1(x)$, since deaths are driven by ‘events’ and not linked to individuals.

3.3 Discrete birth events

We shall consider two different approaches to birth events. Just as in the case of deaths, a fundamental distinction will be that in the approach outlined in this subsection, births will be based on events and particle levels will evolve in a series of jumps, whereas in the next subsection, births will be individual based and levels will evolve continuously, according to the solution of a differential equation. To emphasize this point, we shall refer to discrete and continuous birth events.

A discrete birth event involves the selection of a parent, the determination of the number of offspring, and the placement of the offspring. Parental selection is controlled by a function r , $r(x) \geq 0$ (the larger $r(x)$, the more likely an individual of type x is to be the parent); the number of offspring is specified by an integer k ; and the placement of the offspring is determined by a transition function $q(x, dy)$ from E to E^k . In this discrete model, we assume that the parent is eliminated from the population.

At the time of a birth event, k points are chosen independently and uniformly on $[0, \lambda]$. These will be the levels of the offspring of the event. Let v^* denote the minimum of the

k new levels. For old points $(x, u) \in \eta$ with $u > v^*$ and $r(x) > 0$, let τ_x be defined by $e^{-r(x)\tau_x} = \frac{\lambda - u}{\lambda - v^*}$ and for $(x, u) \in \eta$ satisfying $u < v^*$ and $r(x) > 0$, let τ_x be determined by $e^{-r(x)\tau_x} = \frac{u}{v^*}$. Note that in both cases, τ_x is exponentially distributed with parameter $r(x)$. Taking (x^*, u^*) to be the point in η with $\tau_{x^*} = \min_{(x,u) \in \eta} \tau_x$, we have

$$P\{x^* = x'\} = \frac{r(x')}{\int r(x)\bar{\eta}(dx)}, \quad x' \in \bar{\eta}.$$

After the event, the configuration $\gamma_{k,r,q}\eta$ of levels and types in the population is obtained by assigning types $(y_1, \dots, y_k)$ with joint distribution $q(x^*, dy)$ uniformly at random to the k new levels and transforming the old levels so that

$$\begin{aligned} \gamma_{k,r,q}\eta = & \{(x, \lambda - (\lambda - u)e^{r(x)\tau_{x^*}}) : (x, u) \in \eta, \tau_x > \tau_{x^*}, u > v^*\} \\ & \cup \{(x, ue^{r(x)\tau_{x^*}}) : (x, u) \in \eta, \tau_x > \tau_{x^*}, u < v^*\} \\ & \cup \{(y_i, v_i), i = 1, \dots, k\}. \end{aligned}$$

Notice that the parent has been removed from the population and that if $r(x) = 0$, the point (x, u) is unchanged.

Since x^* and τ_{x^*} are deterministic functions of η and $v^* \equiv \wedge_{j=1}^k v_k$, for $(x, u) \in \eta$, $(x, u) \neq (x^*, u^*)$, that is an ‘old’ individual which is not the parent, we can write the new level as $h_r^\lambda(x, u, \eta, v^*)$. Then

$$f(\gamma_{k,r,q}\eta) = \prod_{(x,u) \in \eta, u \neq u^*} g(x, h_r^\lambda(x, u, \eta, v^*)) \prod g(y_i, v_i).$$

By construction, conditional on $\{(y_i, v_i)\}$ and $\bar{\eta}$, $\{h_r^\lambda(x, u, y, v) : (x, u) \in \eta, u \neq u^*\}$ are independent and uniformly distributed on $[0, \lambda]$, so

$$E[f(\gamma_{k,r,q}\eta) | \bar{\eta}] = \sum_{x' \in \eta} \frac{r(x')}{\int r(x)\bar{\eta}(dx)} \alpha f(\bar{\eta}) \frac{1}{\bar{g}(x')} \int \prod_{i=1}^k \bar{g}(y_i) q(x', dy).$$

Of course if $\int r(x)\bar{\eta}(dx) = 0$, there is no parent and $\gamma_{k,r,q}\eta = \eta$.

This tells us how a configuration will be transformed by a single discrete birth event. Now, just as in the previous subsection, we suppose that the events are parametrized by some abstract space, this time denoted by $\mathbb{U}_b$, equipped with a measure μ_{db} that determines the intensity of events. The discrete birth generator will then be of the form

$$A_{db}f(\eta) = \int_{\mathbb{U}_b} (H_{k(z), r(\cdot, z), q(\cdot, z, \cdot)}(g, \eta) - f(\eta)) \mu_{db}(dz),$$

where

$$\begin{aligned} H_{k(z), r(\cdot, z), q(\cdot, z, \cdot)}(g, \eta) = & \lambda^{-k(z)} \int_{[0, \lambda]^{k(z)}} \prod_{(x,u) \in \eta, u \neq u^*(\eta, v^*)} g(x, h_{r(\cdot, z)}^\lambda(x, u, \eta, v^*)) \\ & \int_{E^{k(z)}} \prod_{i=1}^{k(z)} g(y_i, v_i) q(x^*(\eta, v^*), z, dy) dv_1 \dots dv_{k(z)}. \end{aligned}$$

Integrating out the levels gives

$$\alpha A_{db} f(\bar{\eta}) = \int_{\mathbb{U}_{db}} \mathbf{1}_{\{\int r(x,z)\bar{\eta}(dx) > 0\}} \left(\sum_{x' \in \bar{\eta}} \frac{r(x', z)}{\int r(x, z)\bar{\eta}(dx)} \alpha f(\bar{\eta}) \frac{1}{\bar{g}(x')} \left(\int_{E^{k(z)}} \prod_{i=1}^{k(z)} \bar{g}(y_i) q(x', z, dy) \right) - \alpha f(\bar{\eta}) \right) \mu_{db}(dz).$$

If we wish to pass to a high density limit, we must control the size and frequency of the jumps in the level of an individual so that the level process converges as we increase λ . To investigate the restriction that this will impose on the discrete birth events, we examine $h_r^\lambda(x, u, \eta, v^*)$ more closely. Recall that for $u > v^*$, τ_x is defined by $e^{-r(x)\tau_x} = (\lambda - u)/(\lambda - v^*)$. Evidently, we are only interested in the case when $\lambda^{-1}\bar{\eta}_\lambda$ converges to a non-trivial limit, and in changes in those levels that we actually ‘see’ in our limiting model, that is, to levels that are of order one. For such changes, v^* will also be order one, and then it is easy to see that for λ sufficiently large, we will have $u^* > v^*$ and, since $(\lambda - u^*)/(\lambda - v^*) \rightarrow 1$, $\tau_{x^*} \rightarrow 0$ as $\lambda \rightarrow \infty$. Now

$$\begin{aligned} h_r^\lambda(x, u, \eta, v^*) &= \mathbf{1}_{\{u > v^*\}} (\lambda - (\lambda - u)e^{r(x)\tau_{x^*}}) + \mathbf{1}_{\{u < v^*\}} ue^{r(x)\tau_{x^*}} \\ &= \mathbf{1}_{\{u > v^*\}} (ue^{r(x)\tau_{x^*}} - \lambda(e^{r(x)\tau_{x^*}} - 1)) + \mathbf{1}_{\{u < v^*\}} ue^{r(x)\tau_{x^*}}, \end{aligned} \quad (3.3)$$

and so it follows that for $u < v^*$, $h_r^\lambda(x, u, \eta, v^*) = ue^{r(x)\tau_{x^*}} \rightarrow u$. However, for $(x, u) \in \eta$ with $u > v^*$, $u \neq u^*$, and $r(x) > 0$,

$$\begin{aligned} h_r^\lambda(x, u, \eta, v^*) &= ue^{r(x)\tau_{x^*}} - \lambda(e^{r(x)\tau_{x^*}} - 1) \\ &= ue^{r(x)\tau_{x^*}} - \lambda \frac{(e^{r(x)\tau_{x^*}} - 1)}{(e^{r(x^*)\tau_{x^*}} - 1)} (e^{r(x^*)\tau_{x^*}} - 1) \\ &= ue^{r(x)\tau_{x^*}} - \lambda \frac{(e^{r(x)\tau_{x^*}} - 1)}{(e^{r(x^*)\tau_{x^*}} - 1)} \left(\frac{\lambda - v^*}{\lambda - u^*} - 1 \right) \\ &= ue^{r(x)\tau_{x^*}} - \frac{\lambda}{\lambda - u^*} (u^* - v^*) \frac{(e^{r(x)\tau_{x^*}} - 1)}{(e^{r(x^*)\tau_{x^*}} - 1)} \\ &\rightarrow u - (u^* - v^*) \frac{r(x)}{r(x^*)}. \end{aligned} \quad (3.4)$$

Since for a given k , the probability that v^* will be of order one is proportional to k/λ , from this calculation it is clear that, regardless of balancing death events, to have stable behavior of the levels as $\lambda \rightarrow \infty$, we must have

$$\lim_{\lambda \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{\lambda} \int_{\mathbb{U}_b} k(z) \mathbf{1}_{\{r(x,z) > 0\}} \mu_b^\lambda(dz) < \infty$$

for each x . If the limit were infinite for some x , then then each individual of that type would instantaneously become a parent and be removed from the population.

3.4 Continuous birth

As an alternative to the birth process described above, in which levels move by discrete jumps, in this subsection we consider a birth process in which births are based on individuals and levels move continuously. Our aim is to obtain a construction of a pure birth process in which an individual of type x gives birth to k offspring at a rate $r(x)$. For simplicity, we assume that offspring adopt the type of their parent. In the model with levels, an individual $(x, u) \in \eta$ gives birth to k offspring at rate $r(x, u) = (k+1)(\lambda - u)^k \lambda^{-k} r(x)$. The parent remains in the population and the offspring are assigned levels independently and uniformly distributed above the level of the parent. Evidently this will result in an increase in the proportion of individuals with higher levels and so to preserve the conditionally uniform distribution of levels, we make them move downwards. We shall do this by making them evolve according to a differential equation $\dot{u} = r(x)G_k^\lambda(u)$, for an appropriate choice of the function G_k^λ .

At first sight, there is something arbitrary about the choice of the dependence of branching rate on level. It is, of course, essential that $\lambda^{-1} \int_0^\lambda r(x, u) du = r(x)$, so that when we average out over its level, the expected branching rate of an individual of type x is indeed $r(x)$. However, in principle, other choices of $r(x, u)$ with this property would work, provided we change the differential equation driving the levels. This particular choice has the advantage that it makes calculation of the averaged generator, and hence identification of G_k^λ , very straightforward.

The generator of the process with levels is of the form

$$A_{cb,k}f(\eta) = f(\eta) \sum_{(x,u) \in \eta} r(x) \left[\frac{(k+1)}{\lambda^k} \int_u^\lambda \cdots \int_u^\lambda \left(\prod_{i=1}^k g(x, v_i) - 1 \right) dv_1 \cdots dv_k \right. \\ \left. + G_k^\lambda(u) \frac{\partial_u g(x, u)}{g(x, u)} \right]. \quad (3.5)$$

For brevity, for the rest of this subsection, we drop the subscript k in the generator. In order to calculate αA_{cb} , for each $x \in \bar{\eta}$, write $\bar{\eta}_x$ for $\bar{\eta} \setminus x$. Then

$$\alpha A_{cb}f(\eta) = \sum_{x \in \bar{\eta}} r(x) f(\bar{\eta}_x) \frac{1}{\lambda} \int_0^\lambda g(x, u) \left[\frac{(k+1)}{\lambda^k} \int_u^\lambda \cdots \int_u^\lambda \left(\prod_{i=1}^k g(x, v_i) - 1 \right) dv_1 \cdots dv_k du \right. \\ \left. + \frac{1}{\lambda} \int_0^\lambda G_k^\lambda(u) \partial_u g(x, u) du \right]$$

Now observe that

$$\frac{k+1}{\lambda^{k+1}} \int_0^\lambda g(x, u) \int_u^\lambda \cdots \int_u^\lambda \prod_{i=1}^k g(x, v_i) dv_1 \cdots dv_k du = \left(\frac{1}{\lambda} \int_0^\lambda g(x, u) du \right)^{k+1}.$$

To see this, notice that on the right side we have the result of averaging over $k+1$ independent uniform levels, while on the left we have $(k+1)$ times the result of averaging over those levels if we specify that the first level is the smallest, and by symmetry any of the $k+1$ uniform

variables is equally likely to be the smallest. This deals with the first term of the averaged generator. All that remains is

$$\frac{1}{\lambda} \int_0^\lambda (G_k^\lambda(u) \partial_u g(x, u) - \frac{(k+1)(\lambda-u)^k}{\lambda^k} g(x, u)) du. \quad (3.6)$$

Now we make a judicious choice of G_k^λ . Suppose that

$$G_k^\lambda(u) = \lambda^{-k}(\lambda - u)^{k+1} - (\lambda - u),$$

then, noting that $G_k^\lambda(0) = G_k^\lambda(\lambda) = 0$, and integrating by parts, we see that (3.6) reduces to

$$-\frac{1}{\lambda} \int_0^\lambda g(x, u) du$$

and so we obtain

$$\alpha A_{cb} f(\bar{\eta}) = \alpha f(\bar{\eta}) \sum_{x \in \bar{\eta}} r(x) [\bar{g}(x)^k - 1],$$

which is the generator of a branching process, as required.

Letting $\lambda \rightarrow \infty$ and observing that

$$G_k^\lambda(u) = u \frac{(1 - \frac{u}{\lambda})^{k+1} - (1 - \frac{u}{\lambda})}{\frac{u}{\lambda}} \rightarrow -ku,$$

we obtain

$$A_{cb}^\infty f(\eta) = -f(\eta) \sum_{(x,u) \in \eta} r(x) k u \frac{\partial_u g(x, u)}{g(x, u)}.$$

Assuming $\lambda^{-1} \eta_\lambda(\cdot \times [0, \lambda]) \rightarrow \Xi$, we have $\alpha f(\Xi) = e^{-\int_E h(x) \Xi(dx)}$ and

$$\begin{aligned} \alpha A_{cb}^\infty f(\Xi) &= -e^{-\int_E h(x) \Xi(dx)} \int_E r(x) k \int_0^\infty u \partial_u g(x, u) du \Xi(dx) \\ &= e^{-\int_E h(x) \Xi(dx)} \int_E r(x) k \int_0^\infty (g(x, u) - 1) du \Xi(dx) \\ &= -e^{-\int_E h(x) \Xi(dx)} \int_E r(x) k h(x) \Xi(dx), \end{aligned}$$

which corresponds to the evolution of Ξ given by

$$\Xi_t(dx) = e^{r(x)kt} \Xi_0(dx).$$

3.5 One for one replacement

So far, we have considered separately the births and deaths of individuals in the population. In some models, it is natural to think of offspring as replacing individuals in the population and, thereby, maintaining constant population size. In this section we consider three different models of one-for-one replacement. For $\lambda < \infty$ we shall suppose that the population size is

finite. In the first model, we specify a number $k < |\eta|$ of individuals to be replaced. Those individuals are then sampled uniformly at random from the population. In the second model, the probability, $r(x)$, that an individual of type x is replaced is specified. In the third, there is a probability distribution $p(S)$ over the subsets $S \subset \eta$ that determines the subset to be replaced. We require $p(S)$ to depend only on the types of the members of S and not on their levels. (Of course the first two versions can be viewed as special cases of the third.)

In all three cases, we can take the levels to be fixed. The parent (x^*, u^*) is taken to be the individual chosen to be replaced that has the lowest level. We assume that the types of the new individuals are chosen independently with distribution given by a transition function $q(x^*, dy)$, but we could allow dependence provided the new individuals are assigned to the chosen levels uniformly at random.

The first two models can both be modified in such a way that events affect only a subset $C \subset E$ and this allows us to replace the requirement that η be finite by a local condition (for example $\eta(C) < \infty$). In the third model, we can replace $p(S)$ (a probability) by $r(S)$ (a rate) giving the intensity for a replacement event involving the individuals in S .

For the first model, it is natural to take a generator of the form

$$A_{dr,1}f(\eta) = \int_{\mathbb{U}_{dr,1}} \sum_{S \subset \eta, |S|=k(z)} f(\eta) \left(\prod_{(x,u) \in S} \frac{\int g(y,u)q(x^*(S), z, dy)}{g(x,u)} - 1 \right) \mu_{dr,1}(dz)$$

where $x^*(S) = x'$ if $(x', u') \in S$ and $u' = \min\{u : (x, u) \in S\}$. As usual, $\mathbb{U}_{dr,1}$ parametrizes the events and they occur with intensity $\mu_{dr,1}$. The levels are fixed and the individuals chosen to be replaced ‘look down’, just as in the simple example of §1.2, to identify their parental type. Averaging over levels yields

$$\alpha A_{dr,1}f(\bar{\eta}) = \int_{\mathbb{U}_{dr,1}} \sum_{S \subset \bar{\eta}, |S|=k(z)} \alpha f(\bar{\eta}) \frac{1}{k(z)} \sum_{x' \in S} \left(\prod_{x \in S} \frac{\int \bar{g}(y)q(x', z, dy)}{\bar{g}(x)} - 1 \right) \mu_{dr,1}(dz).$$

In the second case, let $\xi_{x,u}$ be independent random variables with $P\{\xi_{x,u} = 1\} = 1 - P\{\xi_{x,u} = 0\} = r(x)$. Then $(x^*, u^*) \in \eta$ is the parent if $u^* = \min\{u : \xi_{x,u} = 1\}$. Let

$$\widehat{g}(x, z, u) = \int_E g(y, u)q(x, z, dy).$$

Once again we can fix the levels, in which case the generator will take the form

$$A_{dr,2}f(\eta) = \int_{\mathbb{U}_{dr,2}} \left(E \left[\prod_{(x,u) \in \eta} (\xi_{x,u} \widehat{g}(x^*, z, u) + (1 - \xi_{x,u})g(x, u)) \right] - f(\eta) \right) \mu_{dr,2}(dz), \quad (3.7)$$

where the expectation is with respect to the $\xi_{x,u}$ and x^* is a function of η and the $\{\xi_{x,u}\}$. More precisely, x^* is a function of η and the subset S of the individuals for which $\xi_{x,u} = 1$. Recall our assumption that there is a u_g such that $g(x, u) = 1$ for all $u > u_g$. Thus the factor

in the product in (3.7) is 1 if $u \geq u_g$ and so the expectation can be written as

$$\begin{aligned}
H(g, \hat{g}, \eta, z) &\equiv E\left[\prod_{(x,u) \in \eta, u \leq u_g} (\xi_{x,u} \hat{g}(x^*, z, u) + (1 - \xi_{x,u})g(x, u))\right] \\
&= \sum_{S \subset \eta|E \times [0, u_g]} E\left[\prod_{(x,u) \in S} (\xi_{x,u} \hat{g}(x^*(S), z, u) \prod_{(x,u) \in S^c} (1 - \xi_{x,u})g(x, u))\right] \\
&= \sum_{S \subset \eta|E \times [0, u_g]} \prod_{(x,u) \in S} (\hat{g}(x^*(S), z, u)r(x, z)) \prod_{(x,u) \notin S, u \leq u_g} (1 - r(x, z))g(x, u) \quad (3.8)
\end{aligned}$$

Partitioning on the lowest level particle, we see that this expression can be written as

$$\begin{aligned}
&\sum_{(x^*, u^*) \in \eta} r(x^*, z) \hat{g}(x^*, z, u^*) \prod_{(x,u) \in \eta, u < u^*} (1 - r(x, z))g(x, u) \\
&\quad \times \prod_{(x,u) \in \eta, u > u^*} ((1 - r(x, z))g(x, u) + r(x, z)\hat{g}(x^*, z, u)).
\end{aligned}$$

In particular, note that H depends only on g and η . Note that $(1 - r(x, u))g(x, u) + r(x, u)\hat{g}(x^*, z, u) = 1$ if $u > u_g$.

Since

$$\lambda^{-k} \int_0^\lambda g(u') \left(\int_{u'}^\lambda g(u) du \right)^{k-1} du' = \frac{1}{k} \left(\lambda^{-1} \int_0^\lambda g(u) du \right)^k,$$

(c.f. the calculations in §3.4) it follows from (3.8) that

$$\begin{aligned}
\alpha A_{dr,2} f(\bar{\eta}) &= \int_{\mathbb{U}_{dr,2}} \left(\sum_{\bar{S} \subset \bar{\eta}} \left(\prod_{x \in \bar{S}} r(x, z) \right) \left(\frac{1}{|\bar{S}|} \sum_{y \in \bar{S}} \bar{g}(y, z)^{|\bar{S}|} \right) \left(\prod_{x \in \bar{\eta} - \bar{S}} (1 - r(x, z)) \bar{g}(x) \right) \right. \\
&\quad \left. - \alpha f(\bar{\eta}) \right) \mu_{dr,2}(dz),
\end{aligned}$$

where $\bar{g}(y, z) = \lambda^{-1} \int_0^\lambda \hat{g}(y, z, u) du$.

In the third case, we can write

$$A_{dr,3} f(\eta) = \sum_{S \subset \eta} \int_{\mathbb{U}_{dr,3}} r(S, z) f(\eta) \left(\prod_{(x,u) \in S} \frac{\int g(y, u) q(x^*(S), z, dy)}{g(x, u)} - 1 \right) \mu_{dr,3}(dz) \quad (3.9)$$

and

$$\alpha A_{dr,3} f(\bar{\eta}) = \int_{\mathbb{U}_{dr,3}} \sum_{\bar{S} \subset \bar{\eta}} r(\bar{S}, z) \alpha f(\bar{\eta}) \frac{1}{|\bar{S}|} \sum_{x' \in \bar{S}} \left(\prod_{x \in \bar{S}} \frac{\int \bar{g}(y) q(x', z, dy)}{\bar{g}(x)} - 1 \right) \mu_{dr,3}(dz).$$

So far we have dealt with finite population models with one-for-one replacement. We now turn our attention to infinite population limits. For the first model, $A_{dr,1}$, there are two natural ways to consider infinite population limits. In one, the rate at which birth events occur remains the same, but the size of the event grows with λ , that is,

$$\lambda^{-1} k_\lambda(z) \rightarrow \kappa(z) < |\Xi| = \lim_{\lambda \rightarrow \infty} \lambda^{-1} |\eta_\lambda|.$$

Asymptotically, this model behaves in the same way as $A_{dr,2}$ in the special case in which $r(x, z) \equiv \kappa(z)/|\Xi|$ and so we don't consider it here.

The other possibility is for $k(z)$ to remain fixed, but for $\mu_{dr,1}$ to increase with λ , that is, to have replacement events occur at an increasingly rapid rate. (For example, this is the approach when we pass from a Moran model to a Fleming-Viot process.)

First we identify the appropriate scaling. Assume that $\lambda^{-1}\eta_\lambda(t, \cdot) \Rightarrow \Xi(t, dx)$, where $\Xi(t, E) < \infty$. If a discrete birth event z occurs at time t , then conditional on $\eta_\lambda(t, \cdot \times [0, \lambda])$ and z , the number of individuals selected with levels below a , where $0 < a < \lambda$, is binomial with parameters $k(z)$ and $\frac{\eta_\lambda(t, E \times [0, a])}{\eta_\lambda(t, E \times [0, \lambda])} = O(\lambda^{-1})$. Since the probability of selecting two levels below a is $O(\lambda^{-2})$, if we are to see any interaction between levels in the limiting model, we need to scale $\mu_{dr,1}$ by λ^2 . On the other hand, if we scale $\mu_{dr,1}$ by λ^2 , the rate at which the individual at a fixed level is selected is of order λ . When this happens, unless it is one of the (finite rate) events in which more than one level below a is selected, the individual at the selected level will necessarily be the parent of the event and so will jump to a new position determined by the transition density q . If the limiting model is to make sense, we must therefore rescale q in such a way that in the limit, the motion of a fixed level will be well defined.

To make this more precise, suppose that an event of type z occurs at time t . If an individual has level u , the probability that they are the parent of the event is

$$\frac{\binom{\eta_\lambda(t, E \times (u, \lambda])}{k(z)-1}}{\binom{\eta_\lambda(t, E \times [0, \lambda])}{k(z)}} \approx \frac{k(z)}{\eta_\lambda(t, E \times [0, \lambda])}.$$

Assume that q depends on λ . Then the motion of a particle at level u due to its being chosen as a parent is (essentially) Markov with generator

$$\tilde{B}_\lambda g(x) = \frac{\lambda^2}{\eta_\lambda(t, E \times [0, \lambda])} \int_{\mathbb{U}_{dr,1}} k(z)(g(y) - g(x))q_\lambda(x, z, dy)\mu_{dr,1}(dz).$$

We assume that the Markov process with generator

$$B_\lambda g(x) = \lambda \int_{\mathbb{U}_{dr,1}} k(z)(g(y) - g(x))q_\lambda(x, z, dy)\mu_{dr,1}(dz)$$

converges in distribution to a Markov process with generator B and then this Markov process will describe the motion of a fixed level that results from it being selected as parent of a replacement event. Note that this convergence implies that for each $\epsilon > 0$,

$$\int k(z)\mathbf{1}_{\{d(y,x) > \epsilon\}}q_\lambda(x, z, dy)\mu_{dr}(dz) = O(\lambda^{-1}). \quad (3.10)$$

Similarly, we identify the interaction between distinct levels in the limiting process. If there are individuals at levels $u_1 < u_2$ and an event of type z occurs at time t , then the probability that u_1, u_2 are the lowest two levels selected is

$$\frac{\binom{\eta_\lambda(t, E \times (u_2, \lambda])}{k(z)-2}}{\binom{\eta_\lambda(t, E \times [0, \lambda])}{k(z)}} \approx \frac{k(z)(k(z)-1)}{\eta_\lambda(t, E \times [0, \lambda])^2} = O(\lambda^{-2}).$$

We chose our rescaling in such a way that events involving two levels below a fixed level a will occur at a rate $O(1)$, and by (3.10), after the event, asymptotically, both the parent and the offspring will have the type of the parent immediately before the event.

If the replacement process is the only process affecting the population, then

$$|\Xi| = \Xi(t, E) = \lim_{\lambda \rightarrow \infty} \frac{\eta_\lambda(t, E \times [0, \lambda])}{\lambda}$$

is constant in time and (recalling that $g(x, u) = 1$ for $u > u_g$) the limiting model will have generator

$$\begin{aligned} A_{dr,1}^\infty f(\eta) &= \int_{E \times [0, \infty)} \frac{1}{|\Xi|} f(\eta) \frac{Bg(x, u)}{g(x, u)} \eta(dx, du) \\ &\quad + \int_{\mathbb{U}_{dr,1}} \frac{k(z)(k(z) - 1)}{|\Xi|^2} \sum_{(x_1, u_1), (x_2, u_2) \in \eta, u_1 < u_2} f(\eta) \left(\frac{g(x_1, u_2)}{g(x_2, u_2)} - 1 \right) \mu_{dr,1}(dz) \\ &= \int_{E \times [0, \infty)} \frac{1}{|\Xi|} f(\eta) \frac{Bg(x, u)}{g(x, u)} \eta(dx, du) \\ &\quad + \int_{\mathbb{U}_{dr,1}} \frac{k(z)(k(z) - 1)}{|\Xi|^2} \\ &\quad \times \sum_{(x_1, u_1), (x_2, u_2) \in \eta} \frac{f(\eta)}{g(x_1, u_1)g(x_2, u_2)} (\mathbf{1}_{\{u_1 < u_2\}} (g(x_1, u_2)g(x_1, u_1) - g(x_2, u_2)g(x_1, u_1))) \mu_{dr,1}(dz) \end{aligned}$$

Applying A.3, the averaged generator becomes

$$\begin{aligned} \alpha A_{dr,1}^\infty f(\Xi) &= -e^{-\int_E h(x)\Xi(dx)} \left[\int_E \frac{1}{|\Xi|} \int_E Bh(x)\Xi(dx) \right. \\ &\quad \left. + \int_{\mathbb{U}_{dr,1}} \frac{k(z)(k(z) - 1)}{2|\Xi|^2} \int_{E \times E} (h(x_1)^2 - h(x_1)h(x_2)) \Xi(dx_1)\Xi(dx_2) \right] \mu_{dr,1}(dz). \end{aligned}$$

The dependence of the first term on $\mu_{dr,1}$ is absorbed into our definition of B . If $|\Xi| \equiv 1$ and $k(z) = 2$ for all z , then we recognize the generator of a Fleming-Viot diffusion.

It is elementary to identify the limit of our second model as λ tends to infinity. Since $g(x, u) = 1$ for $u > u_g$, the only changes that we ‘see’ are those that affect $\eta^{u_g} = \sum_{(x,u) \in \eta, u \leq u_g} \delta_{(x,u)}$ and these are determined by the generator when $\lambda = u_g$. Recall that

$$A_{dr,2}^\infty f(\eta) = \int_{\mathbb{U}_{dr,2}} \left(H(g, \hat{g}, \eta, z) - f(\eta) \right) \mu_{dr,2}(dz), \quad (3.11)$$

with H given by (3.8). If η is conditionally Poisson with Cox measure $\Xi(dx)du$, $\{\xi_{x,u,z}\}$ are independent with $P\{\xi_{x,u,z} = 1\} = 1 - P\{\xi_{x,u,z} = 0\} = r(x, z)$, and

$$\eta_1 = \sum_{(x,u) \in \eta} \xi_{x,u,z} \delta_{(x,u)}, \quad \eta_2 = \sum_{(x,u) \in \eta} (1 - \xi_{x,u,z}) \delta_{(x,u)},$$

then η_1 and η_2 are conditionally independent given Ξ , η_1 and η_2 are conditionally Poisson with Cox measures $r(x, z)\Xi(dx)du$ and $(1 - r(x, z))\Xi(dx)du$ respectively and the cumulative

distribution function of the level of the lowest particle to be replaced is $1 - e^{-u \int r(x,z) \Xi(dx)}$. Recalling that the x coordinates of the points in η_1 , ordered according to the u coordinates, are exchangeable with de Finetti measure

$$\frac{r(x, z) \Xi(dx)}{\int_E r(y, z) \Xi(dy)},$$

we see

$$\begin{aligned} E[H(g, \hat{g}, \eta, z) | \Xi] &= e^{-\int_E h(x)(1-r(x,z)) \Xi(dx)} \int_E \int_0^\infty r(x^*, z) \hat{g}(x^*, z, u) e^{-u \int_E r(x,z) \Xi(dx)} \\ &\quad \times e^{-\int_u^\infty (1-\hat{g}(x^*, z, v)) dv \int_E r(x,z) \Xi(dx)} \Xi(dx^*) du \\ &= e^{-\int_E h(x)(1-r(x,z)) \Xi(dx)} \int_E \int_0^\infty r(x^*, z) \hat{g}(x^*, z, u) e^{-\int_0^u \hat{g}(x^*, z, v) dv \int_E r(x,z) \Xi(dx)} \\ &\quad \times e^{-\hat{h}(x^*, z) \int_E r(x,z) \Xi(dx)} \Xi(dx^*) du \\ &= e^{-\int_E h(x)(1-r(x,z)) \Xi(dx)} \int_E \frac{r(x^*, z)}{\int_E r(x, z) \Xi(dx)} e^{-\hat{h}(x^*, z) \int_E r(x,z) \Xi(dx)} \Xi(dx^*) du \\ &\equiv \mathbb{H}(h, \hat{h}, \Xi, z), \end{aligned}$$

and

$$\alpha A_{dr,2}^\infty = \int_{\mathbb{U}_{dr,2}} (\mathbb{H}(h, \hat{h}, \Xi, z) - \alpha f(\Xi)) \mu_{dr,2}(dz).$$

Evidently, since $A_{dr,1}$ and $A_{dr,2}$ are special cases of $A_{dr,3}$ and their continuous density limits are quite different, we can't expect a general result for the continuous density limit of $A_{dr,3}$, but a large class of limits should retain the discrete model form

$$A_{dr,3}^\infty f(\eta) = \sum_{S \subset \eta} \int_{\mathbb{U}_{dr,3}} r(S, z) f(\eta) \left(\prod_{(x,u) \in S} \frac{\int g(y, u) q(x^*(S), z, dy)}{g(x, u)} - 1 \right) \mu_{dr,3}(dz),$$

provided there is a sufficiently large class of functions g satisfying

$$\sum_{S \subset \eta} \int_{\mathbb{U}_{dr,3}} r(S, z) \sum_{(x,u) \in S} \left| \int (g(y, u) - g(x, u)) q(x^*(S), z, dy) \right| \mu_{dr,3}(dz) < \infty \quad (3.12)$$

with $0 \leq g \leq 1$ and $g(x, u) \equiv 1$ for $u > u_g$. In Section 4.1, we consider an example in which we can center $g(y, u) - g(x, u)$ in order to weaken the condition in (3.12). The form of the averaged generator is problem dependent, but convex combinations of $\alpha A_{dr,1}^\infty$ and $\alpha A_{dr,2}^\infty$ can arise.

3.6 Independent thinning

Independent thinning will work in essentially the same way as the pure death process. However, whereas in the pure death process the levels grew continuously, here we scale them

up by a (type-dependent) factor at discrete times. Levels which are above level λ after this multiplication are removed. The generator with finite λ is then of the form

$$A_{th}f(\eta) = \int_{\mathbb{U}_{th}} \left(\prod_{(x,u) \in \eta} g(x, u\rho(x, z)) - f(\eta) \right) \mu_{th}(dz).$$

Setting $\rho(x, z) = \frac{1}{1-p(x, z)}$, we see that the probability that $\rho(x, z)U_x > \lambda$, for U_x uniformly distributed on $[0, \lambda]$, is $P\{U_x > \lambda/\rho(t, x)\} = p(t, x)$. Recalling that $g(x, u) = 1$ for $u \geq \lambda$ and integrating out the levels gives

$$\alpha A_{th}f(\bar{\eta}) = \int_{\mathbb{U}_{th}} \left(\prod_{x \in \bar{\eta}} ((1 - p(x, z))\bar{g}(x) + p(x, z)) - \alpha f(\bar{\eta}) \right) \mu_{th}(dz),$$

which says that when a thinning event of type z occurs individuals are independently eliminated with (type-dependent) probability $p(x, z)$.

In the continuous population limit, the form of A_{th} remains unchanged, and the projected operator becomes

$$\alpha f(\Xi) = \int_{\mathbb{U}_{th}} \left(e^{-\int_E \frac{1}{\rho(x, z)} h(x) \Xi(dx)} - \alpha f(\Xi) \right) \mu_{th}(dz),$$

where as usual $h(x) = \int_0^\infty (1 - g(x, u))du$ and $\alpha f(\Xi) = e^{-\int_E h(x) \Xi(dx)}$.

3.7 Immigration

Immigration can be modeled by simply assigning each new immigrant a randomly chosen level. This approach gives a generator of the form

$$A_{im}f(\eta) = \int_{\mathbb{U}_{im}} f(\eta) (\lambda^{-1} \int_0^\lambda g(x(z), v)dv - 1) \mu_{im}(dz) = \int_{\mathbb{U}_{im}} f(\eta) (\bar{g}(x(z)) - 1) \mu_{im}(dz),$$

which gives

$$\alpha A_{im}f(\bar{\eta}) = \int_{\mathbb{U}_{im}} \alpha f(\bar{\eta}) (\bar{g}(x(z)) - 1) \mu_{im}(dz).$$

Scaling μ_{im} by λ , and passing to the limit gives

$$A_{im}f(\eta) = - \int_{\mathbb{U}_{im}} f(\eta) h(x(z)) \mu_{im}(dz),$$

and integrating out the levels

$$\alpha A_{im}f(\bar{\eta}) = - \int_{\mathbb{U}_{im}} \alpha f(\bar{\eta}) h(x(z)) \mu_{im}(dz)$$

which implies

$$\frac{d}{dt} \int_E h(x) \Xi_t(dx) = \int_{\mathbb{U}_{im}} h(x(z)) \mu_{im}(dz),$$

as we would expect.

3.8 Independent and exchangeable motion

Typically, population models assume independent motion or mutation causing individual types to change between birth/death events. Some models allow common stochastic effects to influence type changes so that particle types evolve in an exchangeable fashion. In either case, we assume the existence of a collection of process generators B_n , where B_n determines a process with state space E^n , B_n is exchangeable in the sense that if $(X_1, \dots, X_n)$ is a solution of the martingale problem for B_n , then any permutation of the indices $(X_{\sigma_1}, \dots, X_{\sigma_n})$ also gives a solution of the martingale problem for B_n , and the B_n are consistent in the sense that if $(X_1, \dots, X_{n+1})$ is a solution of the martingale problem for B_{n+1} , then $(X_1, \dots, X_n)$ is a solution of the martingale problems for B_n . Of course, if B_n is the generator for n independent particles, each with generator B_1 , then $\{B_n\}$ has the desired properties.

To combine motion with the other possible elements of a model described above, we need a sufficiently rich class of function $g(x, u)$ such that for each n , and fixed $u_1, \dots, u_n$, $\prod_{i=1}^n g(x_i, u_i)$ gives a function in the domain of B_n . In the independent case, this requirement simply means that $g(x, u)$ is in the domain of $B \equiv B_1$, and

$$B_{|\eta|}f(\eta) = f(\eta) \sum_{(x,u) \in \eta} \frac{Bg(x, u)}{g(x, u)}.$$

For finite λ , if $\bar{\eta}(E) < \infty$, then the motion generator is just given by

$$\hat{B}f(\eta) = B_{|\eta|} \prod_{(x,u) \in \eta} g(x, u).$$

For $\lambda = \infty$, since we assume that $g(x, u) \equiv 1$ for $u \geq u_g$, the same formula works provides $\eta(E \times [0, u_g]) < \infty$.

For models with infinitely many particles with levels below a fixed level, we can require the existence of a sequence $K_k \subset E$ such that $\cup_k K_k = E$ and $\eta(K_k \times [0, u_0]) < \infty$ for each k and u_0 . Requiring $g(x, u) = 1$ and $B_1g(x, u) = 0$ for $(x, u) \notin K_k \times [0, u_g]$ for some k would give

$$\hat{B}f(\eta) = B_{\eta(K_k \times [0, u_g])} \prod_{(x,u) \in \eta|_{K_k \times [0, u_g]}} g(x, u). \quad (3.13)$$

Note that this condition simply places restrictions on the size or direction of jumps by the motion process.

For finite λ and $\bar{\eta}(E) < \infty$,

$$\alpha \hat{B}f(\bar{\eta}) = B_{|\eta|} \prod_{x \in \bar{\eta}} \bar{g}(x),$$

and similarly for (3.13). For $\lambda = \infty$, a general derivation for exchangeable but not independent motion is not clear, but for independent motion, observing that $Bg = B(g - 1)$ we have

$$\alpha \hat{B}f(\Xi) = -e^{-\int_E h(x) \Xi(dx)} \int B h(x) \Xi(dx).$$

4 Examples

In this section we illustrate our results in some specific examples. In §4.1, we present two different approaches to the spatial Λ -Fleming-Viot process. The first, based on one-for-one replacement yields, in the high intensity limit, the process with levels of [16] (under somewhat weaker conditions). The second, based on discrete births of Poisson numbers of offspring followed by independent thinning, corresponds in the prelimit to the particle system studied by [2]. In §4.2, we extend this second approach to discrete birth mechanisms in which the number of offspring is no longer required to be Poisson. This yields a new class of population models, in which the replacement mechanism mirrors that of the spatial Λ -Fleming-Viot process, but the population intensity can vary with spatial position. In particular, these models allow for the combination of ecology and genetics described in the introduction. In §4.3, we use one for one replacement in the special case in which just two individuals are involved in each event to recover, in particular, the lookdown construction of [8] for a spatially interacting Moran model. In §4.4, we revisit branching processes and the Dawson-Watanabe superprocess. In §4.5, we use the lookdown construction to derive a stochastic partial differential equation as the limit of rescaled spatially interacting Moran models of the type discussed in §4.3. Finally, §4.6, we give a lookdown construction for a class of voter models and use the construction to give a heuristic argument for a result of Mueller and Tribe [14] showing that the rescaled voter model converges to a solution of the stochastic partial differential equation obtained in §4.5.

4.1 Spatial Λ -Fleming-Viot process

In this example, we distinguish between the location of a particle $x \in \mathbb{R}^d$ and its type $\kappa \in \mathbb{K}$. Consider $A_{dr,2}$ defined in (3.7) with $E = \mathbb{R}^d \times \mathbb{K}$, $\mathbb{U} = \mathbb{R}^d \times [0, 1] \times [0, \infty)$, and $\mu = \ell^d \times \nu^1(w, d\zeta) \times \nu^2(dw)$ where ℓ^d is Lebesgue measure on $\mathbb{R}^d$, ν^2 is a σ -finite measure on $[0, \infty)$ and ν^1 is a transition function from $[0, \infty)$ to $[0, 1]$. Each point in $\mathbb{U}$ specifies a point $y \in \mathbb{R}^d$, $w \in [0, \infty)$ and $\zeta \in [0, 1]$. The corresponding reproduction event will affect the ball $D_{y,w} \subseteq \mathbb{R}^d$ and ζ (often called the impact of the event) will determine the proportion of individuals within the ball to be affected. For an event corresponding to $z = (y, \zeta, w)$, let $r(x, z)$ be $\zeta \mathbf{1}_{D_{y,w}}(x)$ and for $(x, \kappa) \in E$

$$q(x, \kappa, z, dx' \times d\kappa') = v_{y,w}(dx') \delta_\kappa(d\kappa'),$$

where $v_{y,w}$ is the uniform distribution over the ball $D_{y,w}$, that is, the offspring have the same type as the parent and are independently and uniformly distributed over the ball. Consequently,

$$\widehat{g}(x, \kappa, z, u) = \widehat{g}_{y,w}(\kappa, u) \equiv \int g(x', \kappa, z, u) v_{y,w}(dx').$$

In addition, we define

$$\overline{g}_{y,w}(\kappa) \equiv \frac{1}{\lambda} \int_0^\lambda \widehat{g}_{y,w}(\kappa, u) du = \int \frac{1}{\lambda} \int_0^\lambda g(x', \kappa, u) du v_{y,w}(dx').$$

We postpone giving precise conditions on ν^1 and ν^2 until we have formally derived the generators.

From (3.11), $A_{dr,2}^\infty$ is given by

$$A_{dr,2}^\infty f(\eta) = f(\eta) \int_{\mathbb{R}^d \times [0,1] \times [0,\infty)} \left(\frac{\sum_{S \subset \eta(\cdot \cap D_{y,w} \times \mathbb{K} \times [0,u_g])} H(y, \zeta, w, S, g, \widehat{g})}{\prod_{(x,\kappa,u) \in \eta(\cdot \cap D_{y,w} \times \mathbb{K} \times [0,u_g])} g(x, \kappa, u)} - 1 \right) dy \nu^1(w, d\zeta) \nu^2(dw),$$

where we have used $\eta(\cdot \cap D_{y,w} \times \mathbb{K} \times [0, u_g])$ to mean the restriction of η to $D_{y,w} \times \mathbb{K} \times [0, u_g]$ and

$$H(y, \zeta, w, S, g, \widehat{g}) = \prod_{(x,\kappa,u) \in S} (\widehat{g}_{y,w}(\kappa^*(S), u) \zeta) \prod_{(x,\kappa,u) \notin S, x \in D_{y,w}, u \leq u_g} ((1 - \zeta)g(x, \kappa, u)),$$

$\kappa^*(S)$ being the type of the lowest level particle in S . $A_{dr,2}^\infty$ is the generator for the lookdown construction of [16] for the spatial Λ -Fleming-Viot process introduced in [7, 1].

For finite λ , $A_{dr,2}^\lambda f(\eta) = A_{dr,2}^\infty f(\eta)$ provided $u_g \leq \lambda$. Consequently, any solution of the martingale problem for $A_{dr,2}^\infty$ restricted to levels in $[0, \lambda]$ gives a solution of the martingale problem for $A_{dr,2}^\lambda$. In particular, existence and uniqueness for $A_{dr,2}^\lambda$ for all $\lambda > 0$ implies existence and uniqueness for $A_{dr,2}^\infty$.

For finite λ ,

$$\alpha A_{dr,2}^\lambda f(\overline{\eta}) = \alpha f(\overline{\eta}) \int_{\mathbb{R}^d \times [0,1] \times [0,\infty)} \left(\frac{\sum_{S \subset \overline{\eta}(\cdot \cap D_{y,w} \times \mathbb{K})} \overline{H}(y, \zeta, w, S, \overline{g}, \widehat{g})}{\prod_{(x,\kappa) \in \overline{\eta}(\cdot \cap D_{y,w} \times \mathbb{K})} \overline{g}(x, \kappa)} - 1 \right) dy \nu^1(w, d\zeta) \nu^2(dw) \quad (4.14)$$

where

$$\overline{H}(y, \zeta, w, S, \overline{g}, \widehat{g}) = \frac{1}{|S|} \sum_{(x,\kappa) \in S} (\overline{g}_{y,w}(\kappa) \zeta)^{|S|} \prod_{(x,\kappa) \in \overline{\eta}(\cdot \cap D_{y,w} \times \mathbb{K}), (x,\kappa) \notin S} ((1 - \zeta)\overline{g}(x, \kappa)).$$

Finally, setting $h_{y,w}^*(\kappa) = \int_0^\infty (1 - \widehat{g}_{y,w}(\kappa, u)) du$ and

$$\mathbb{H}_1(y, \zeta, w, \Xi, h_{y,w}^*) = \frac{1}{\Xi(D_{y,w} \times \mathbb{K})} \int_{D_{y,w} \times \mathbb{K}} e^{-\zeta h_{y,w}^*(\kappa) \Xi(D_{y,w} \times \mathbb{K})} \Xi(dx \times d\kappa),$$

we have

$$\begin{aligned} & \alpha A_{dr,2}^\infty f(\Xi) \\ &= e^{-\int h(x,\kappa) \Xi(dx, d\kappa)} \\ & \quad \times \int_{\mathbb{R}^d \times [0,1] \times [0,\infty)} (\mathbb{H}_1(y, \zeta, w, \Xi, h_{y,w}^*) e^{\zeta \int_{D_{y,w} \times \mathbb{K}} h(x,\kappa) \Xi(dx, d\kappa)} - 1) dy \nu^1(w, d\zeta) \nu^2(dw). \end{aligned}$$

Note that if Ξ is a solution of the martingale problem for $\alpha A_{dr,2}^\infty$ and $\Xi(0, dx \times \mathbb{K})$ is Lebesgue measure, then $\Xi(t, dx \times \mathbb{K})$ is Lebesgue measure for all $t \geq 0$. (Consider the generator with h not depending on κ .)

We can give an alternative lookdown construction of the spatial Λ -Fleming-Viot process employing discrete births (Section 3.3) and independent thinning (Section 3.6). With $z = (y, \zeta, w)$ as above, the discrete birth event corresponding to z produces a Poisson number of offspring with parameter $\lambda \alpha_z$ for $\alpha_z = \frac{\zeta}{1-\zeta} |D_{y,w}|$, $r(x, z) = \mathbf{1}_{D_{y,w}}(x)$, and

$$q(x, \kappa, z, dx', d\kappa') = v_{y,w}(dx') \delta_\kappa(d\kappa').$$

The finite particle model is then precisely that considered in [2]. Note that the definition of r in this construction is different from the definition in the previous construction. There, r determined the chance of being involved in the event; here we use it to weight the chance of being a parent. Immediately after the birth event, the population is thinned, taking

$$\rho(x, \kappa, z) = 1 + \frac{\zeta}{1 - \zeta} \mathbf{1}_{D_{y,w}}(x).$$

Since each of these transformations preserves the conditional independence of the levels, we can combine them to obtain a generator of the form

$$A_{db,th}^\lambda f(\eta) = \int_{\mathbb{U}} (H_z^\lambda(g, \eta) - f(\eta)) dy \nu^1(w, d\zeta) \nu^2(dw). \quad (4.15)$$

If $\eta(D_{y,w} \times \mathbb{K}) = 0$, then $H_z^\lambda(g, \eta) = f(\eta)$. If $\eta(D_{y,w} \times \mathbb{K}) \neq 0$, we obtain an expression for $H_z^\lambda(g, \eta)$ by partitioning on the lowest level selected by an offspring. Since the levels $\{v_i\}$ selected for the offspring are the jump times in $[0, \lambda]$ of a Poisson process with intensity α_z , this yields

$$\begin{aligned} H_z^\lambda(g, \eta) &= \prod_{(x, \kappa, u) \in \eta, x \notin D_{y,w}} g(x, \kappa, u) \\ &\times \int_0^\lambda \left[\alpha_z e^{-\alpha_z v^*} \widehat{g}_{y,w}(\kappa^*, \frac{1}{1-\zeta} v^*) e^{-\alpha_z \int_{v^*}^\lambda (1 - \widehat{g}_{y,w}(\kappa^*, \frac{1}{1-\zeta} v)) dv} \right. \\ &\quad \left. \times \prod_{(x, \kappa, u) \in \eta, x \in D_{y,w}, u \neq u^*} g(x, \kappa, \frac{1}{1-\zeta} h_{y,w}^\lambda(x, u, \eta, v^*)) \right] dv^*, \end{aligned}$$

where (x^*, κ^*, u^*) is the point in η satisfying $x^* \in D_{y,w}$ and

$$u^* = \operatorname{argmax} \left\{ \frac{\lambda - u}{\lambda - v^*} : (x, \kappa, u) \in \eta, x \in D_{y,w}, u \geq v^* \right\} \cup \left\{ \frac{u}{v^*} : (x, \kappa, u) \in \eta, x \in D_{y,w}, u \geq v^* \right\},$$

and $h_{y,w}^\lambda(x, u, \eta, v^*)$ is obtained as in (3.3) with $r = \mathbf{1}_{D_{y,w}}$.

Let $\bar{\eta}|_{D_{y,w}}$ denote $\bar{\eta}$ restricted to $D_{y,w} \times \mathbb{K}$. Since conditional on $\bar{\eta}$ and v^* , (x^*, κ^*) is selected uniformly at random from $\bar{\eta}|_{D_{y,w}}$ and for $u \neq u^*$, the $h_{y,w}^\lambda(x, u, \eta, v^*)$ are independent and uniform over $[0, \lambda]$, partitioning on the level of the lowest offspring, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \alpha A_{db,th}^\lambda f(\bar{\eta}) &= \alpha f(\bar{\eta}) \int_{\mathbb{U}} \frac{1}{|\bar{\eta}|_{D_{y,w}}|} \sum_{(x^*, \kappa^*) \in \bar{\eta}|_{D_{y,w}}} \frac{1}{\bar{g}(x^*, \kappa^*)} \prod_{(x, \kappa) \in \bar{\eta}|_{D_{y,w}}, (x, \kappa) \neq (x^*, \kappa^*)} \left((1 - \zeta) + \zeta \frac{1}{\bar{g}(x, \kappa)} \right) \\ &\quad \times \int_0^\lambda \left[\alpha_z^\lambda e^{-\alpha_z v^*} \widehat{g}_{y,w}(\kappa^*, \frac{1}{1-\zeta} v^*) e^{-\alpha_z \int_{v^*}^\lambda (1 - \widehat{g}_{y,w}(\kappa^*, \frac{1}{1-\zeta} v)) dv} dv^* dy \nu^1(w, d\zeta) \nu^2(dw) \right] \\ &= \alpha f(\bar{\eta}) \int_{\mathbb{U}} \frac{1}{|\bar{\eta}|_{D_{y,w}}|} \sum_{(x^*, \kappa^*) \in \bar{\eta}|_{D_{y,w}}} \frac{1}{\bar{g}(x^*, \kappa^*)} \prod_{(x, \kappa) \in \bar{\eta}|_{D_{y,w}}, (x, \kappa) \neq (x^*, \kappa^*)} \left((1 - \zeta) + \zeta \frac{1}{\bar{g}(x, \kappa)} \right) \\ &\quad \times e^{-\alpha_z \int_0^\lambda (1 - \widehat{g}_{y,w}(\kappa^*, \frac{1}{1-\zeta} v)) dv} dy \nu^1(w, d\zeta) \nu^2(dw) \\ &= \alpha f(\bar{\eta}) \int_{\mathbb{U}} \frac{1}{|\bar{\eta}|_{D_{y,w}}|} \sum_{(x^*, \kappa^*) \in \bar{\eta}|_{D_{y,w}}} \frac{1}{\bar{g}(x^*, \kappa^*)} \prod_{(x, \kappa) \in \bar{\eta}|_{D_{y,w}}, (x, \kappa) \neq (x^*, \kappa^*)} \left((1 - \zeta) + \zeta \frac{1}{\bar{g}(x, \kappa)} \right) \\ &\quad \times e^{-\lambda \zeta |D_{y,w}| (1 - \bar{g}_{y,w}(\kappa^*))} dy \nu^1(w, d\zeta) \nu^2(dw) \end{aligned}$$

Note that $\alpha A_{db,th}^\lambda$ constructed here is not the same as $\alpha A_{dr,2}^\lambda$ given in (4.14). Here, at each birth/death event, existing particles are randomly killed and an independent number of new particles are created while in the previous construction, the number of births equaled the number of deaths. However, taking $\lambda \rightarrow \infty$, by (3.4),

$$A_{db,th}^\infty f(\eta) = \int_{\mathbb{U}} (H_z(g, \eta) - f(\eta)) dy \nu^1(w, d\zeta) \nu^2(dw), \quad (4.16)$$

with

$$\begin{aligned} H_z(g, \eta) &= \prod_{(x, \kappa, u) \in \eta, x \notin D_{y,w}} g(x, \kappa, u) \\ &\times \int_0^\infty \left[\alpha_z e^{-\alpha_z v^*} \widehat{g}_{y,w}(\kappa^*, \frac{1}{1-\zeta} v^*) e^{-\alpha_z \int_{v^*}^\infty (1 - \widehat{g}_{y,w}(\kappa^*, \frac{1}{1-\zeta} v)) dv} \right. \\ &\times \prod_{(x, \kappa, u) \in \eta, x \in D_{y,w}, u > u^*} g(x, \kappa, \frac{1}{1-\zeta} (u - u^* + v^*)) \\ &\times \left. \prod_{(x, \kappa, u) \in \eta, x \in D_{y,w}, u < u^*} g(x, \kappa, \frac{1}{1-\zeta} u) \right] dv^*. \end{aligned}$$

Noting that η^* satisfying

$$\begin{aligned} \int g d\eta^* &= \sum_{(x, \kappa, u) \in \eta, x \in D_{y,w}, u > u^*} g(x, \kappa, \frac{1}{1-\zeta} (u - u^* + v^*)) \\ &+ \sum_{(x, \kappa, u) \in \eta, x \in D_{y,w}, u < u^*} g(x, \kappa, \frac{1}{1-\zeta} u) \end{aligned}$$

is conditionally Poisson with Cox measure $(1 - \zeta) \Xi(dx, d\kappa)$ and

$$\begin{aligned} \int_0^\infty \alpha_z e^{-\alpha_z v^*} \widehat{g}_{y,w}(\kappa^*, \frac{1}{1-\zeta} v^*) e^{-\alpha_z \int_{v^*}^\infty (1 - \widehat{g}_{y,w}(\kappa^*, \frac{1}{1-\zeta} v)) dv} dv^* \\ = e^{-(1-\zeta)\alpha_z h_{y,w}^*(\kappa^*)}, \end{aligned}$$

averaging gives

$$\begin{aligned} \alpha A_{db,th}^\infty f(\Xi) &= e^{-\int_{\mathbb{R}^d \times \mathbb{K}} h(x, \kappa) \Xi(dx, d\kappa)} \\ &\times \int_{\mathbb{U}} (\mathbb{H}_2(z, \Xi, h_{y,w}^*) e^{\zeta \int_{D_{y,w} \times \mathbb{K}} h(x, \kappa) \Xi(dx, d\kappa)} - 1) dy \nu^1(w, d\zeta) \nu^2(dw), \end{aligned}$$

where

$$\mathbb{H}_2(z, \Xi, h_{y,w}^*) = \frac{1}{\Xi(D_{y,w} \times \mathbb{K})} \int_{D_{y,w} \times \mathbb{K}} e^{-\zeta |D_{y,w}| h_{y,w}^*(\kappa) \Xi(dx \times d\kappa)},$$

which, in general, differs from $\mathbb{H}_1$. However, if Ξ is a solution of the martingale problem with $\Xi(0, dx \times \mathbb{K})$ Lebesgue measure, then $\Xi(t, dx \times \mathbb{K})$ is Lebesgue measure for all $t \geq 0$ and $\mathbb{H}_2(z, \Xi, h_{y,w}^*) = \mathbb{H}_1(z, \Xi, h_{y,w}^*)$. Consequently, in this case, Ξ is also a solution of the martingale problem for $\alpha A_{dr,2}^\infty$ in the previous construction.

Our calculations so far in this subsection have been entirely formal. We now turn to actually constructing the processes that correspond to the generators described above.

4.1.1 First construction of spatial Λ -Fleming-Viot with levels

The process corresponding to $A_{dr,2}^\infty$ appears already in [16], but the strategy of our construction, based on writing down stochastic equations for the type of the particle at the i th level for each i , is somewhat different, and we obtain our process under slightly weaker conditions. In particular, we require

$$\int_1^\infty \int_0^1 \zeta w^d \nu^1(w, d\zeta) \nu^2(dw) < \infty \quad (4.17)$$

and

$$\begin{cases} \int_0^1 \int_0^1 \zeta |w|^2 \nu^1(w, d\zeta) \nu^2(dw) < \infty & \text{if } d = 1, \\ \int_0^1 \int_0^1 \zeta |w|^{2+d} \nu^1(w, d\zeta) \nu^2(dw) < \infty & \text{if } d \geq 2; \end{cases} \quad (4.18)$$

while [16] assumes

$$\int_0^\infty \int_0^1 \zeta w^d \nu^1(w, d\zeta) \nu^2(dw) < \infty. \quad (4.19)$$

The requirement in (4.19) implies that a point in space is involved in a birth/death event only finitely often in a finite time interval while (4.18) allows infinitely many very small birth/death events.

We focus first on the evolution of the particle locations. Let $\{(X_i(0), U_i)\}$ be a spatial Poisson process on $\mathbb{R}^d \times [0, \infty)$ with Lebesgue mean measure. $X_i(0)$ is the initial location of the i th particle and U_i is its level.

Let ξ_0 be a Poisson random measure on $[0, \infty) \times \mathbb{R}^d \times [0, 1] \times [0, \infty)$ with mean measure $ds dy \nu^1(w, d\zeta) \nu^2(dw)$. For each $i \geq 1$, let ξ_i be the Poisson random measure on $[0, \infty) \times \{0, 1\} \times D_{0,1} \times \mathbb{R}^d \times [0, 1] \times [0, \infty)$ with mean measure

$$ds((1 - \zeta)\delta_0(\theta) + \zeta\delta_1(\theta))v_{0,1}(dv)dy\nu^1(w, d\zeta)\nu^2(dw)$$

that is obtained from $\xi_0 = \sum \delta_{(s,y,\zeta,w)}$ by setting

$$\xi_i = \sum_{(s,y,\zeta,w) \in \xi_0} \delta_{(s, \theta_{y,\zeta,w,i}, v_{y,\zeta,w,i}, y, \zeta, w)},$$

where $(\theta_{y,\zeta,w,i}, v_{y,\zeta,w,i})$ has distribution $((1 - \zeta)\delta_0(\theta) + \zeta\delta_1(\theta))v_{0,1}$ and the $(\theta_{y,\zeta,w,i}, v_{y,\zeta,w,i})$ are conditionally independent given ξ_0 . The level of the i th particle is fixed for all time, and the location is given by the solution of

$$\begin{aligned} X_i(t) &= X_i(0) \\ &+ \int_{[0,t] \times \{0,1\} \times D_{0,1} \times \mathbb{R}^d \times [0,1] \times [0,1]} \mathbf{1}_{D_{y,w}}(X_i(s-)) \theta(y + wv - X_i(s-)) \tilde{\xi}_i(ds, d\theta, dv, dy, d\zeta, dw) \\ &+ \int_{[0,t] \times \{0,1\} \times D_{0,1} \times \mathbb{R}^d \times [0,1] \times (1,\infty)} \mathbf{1}_{D_{y,w}}(X_i(s-)) \theta(y + wv - X_i(s-)) \xi_i(ds, d\theta, dv, dy, d\zeta, dw), \end{aligned} \quad (4.20)$$

where $\tilde{\xi}_i$ is ξ_i centered by its mean measure. Centering by the mean measure is legitimate since for each x

$$\int_{\{0,1\} \times D_{0,1} \times \mathbb{R}^d \times [0,1] \times [0,1]} \mathbf{1}_{D_{y,w}}(x) \theta(y+vw-x) ((1-\zeta)\delta_0(d\theta) + \zeta\delta_1(\theta)) v_{0,1}(dv) dy \nu^1(w, d\zeta) \nu^2(dw) = 0.$$

The centered integral is a square integrable martingale M_i with quadratic variation

$$[M_i]_t = \int_{[0,t] \times \{0,1\} \times D_{0,1} \times \mathbb{R}^d \times [0,1] \times [0,1]} \mathbf{1}_{D_{y,w}}(X_i(s-)) \theta|y+vw-X_i(s-)|^2 \xi_i(ds, d\theta, dv, dy, d\zeta, dw)$$

and, by translation invariance,

$$\begin{aligned} E[[M_i]_t] &= t \int_0^1 \int_0^1 \int_{D_{0,w}} \int_{D_{0,1}} \zeta |y+vw|^2 v_{0,1}(dv) dy \nu^1(w, d\zeta) \nu^2(dw) \\ &= t \int_0^1 \int_0^1 \int_{D_{0,w}} \zeta (|y|^2 + |w|^2 c_d) dy \nu^1(w, d\zeta) \nu^2(dw) \\ &= t C_d \int_0^1 \int_0^1 \zeta |w|^{2+d} \nu^1(w, d\zeta) \nu^2(dw), \end{aligned}$$

for appropriate choices of c_d and C_d , explaining the requirement in (4.18). The slightly stronger requirement in the case of $d = 1$ is used below. Existence of solutions of the system (4.20) follows by approximation. Weak uniqueness for a single X_i follows by uniqueness of the corresponding martingale problem. (X_i is a Lévy process.) Unfortunately, weak uniqueness for a single X_i does not imply weak uniqueness for the system. Of course, strong uniqueness for X_i would give strong uniqueness for the system. Strong uniqueness does hold under (4.19), since that condition implies X_i has only finitely many jumps in a finite time interval.

The second stochastic integral term has only finitely many jumps on any bounded time interval, and the intensity for the counting process of jumps is

$$\int_1^\infty \int_0^1 v_d \zeta w^d \nu^1(w, d\zeta) \nu^2(dw),$$

where v_d is the volume of the d -dimensional unit ball, explaining the requirement in (4.17).

We still need to consider the evolution of the type of each particle. Note that the i th particle changes type only if it is involved in a birth/death event with a particle having a lower level. The number of times that particle i and particle j are involved in the same birth/death event up to time t is

$$N_{ij}(t) = \int_{[0,t] \times \mathbb{R}^d \times [0,1] \times [0,\infty)} \mathbf{1}_{D_{y,w}}(X_j(s-)) \mathbf{1}_{D_{y,w}}(X_i(s-)) \theta_{y,\zeta,w,i} \theta_{y,\zeta,w,j} \xi_0(ds, dy, d\zeta, dw)$$

and

$$E[N_{ij}(t)] = \int_{[0,t] \times \mathbb{R}^d \times [0,1] \times [0,\infty)} E[\mathbf{1}_{D_{y,w}}(X_j(s)) \mathbf{1}_{D_{y,w}}(X_i(s))] \zeta^2 ds dy \nu^1(w, d\zeta) \nu^2(dw).$$

Let $C \subset \mathbb{R}^d$ be bounded and $u > 0$, and let $N_{C,u}(t)$ be the number of times by time t that two particles with levels below u and locations in C are involved in the same birth/death event. Then

$$\begin{aligned}
E[N_{C,u}(t)] &= \int_{[0,t] \times \mathbb{R}^d \times [0,1] \times [0,\infty)} E\left[\sum_{U_i < U_j \leq u} \mathbf{1}_C(X_i(s)) \mathbf{1}_C(X_j(s)) \mathbf{1}_{D_{y,w}}(X_j(s)) \mathbf{1}_{D_{y,w}}(X_i(s)) \right] \\
&\quad \times \zeta^2 ds dy \nu^1(w, d\zeta) \nu^2(dw) \\
&= \int_{[0,t] \times \mathbb{R}^d \times [0,1] \times [0,\infty)} E\left[\binom{\eta(s, D_{y,w} \cap C \times [0, u])}{2} \right] \zeta^2 ds dy \nu^1(w, d\zeta) \nu^2(dw) \\
&= \int_{[0,t] \times \mathbb{R}^d \times [0,1] \times [0,\infty)} u^2 \ell^d(D_{y,w} \cap C)^2 \zeta^2 ds dy \nu^1(w, d\zeta) \nu^2(dw) \\
&\leq u^2 \int_{[0,t] \times \mathbb{R}^d \times [0,1] \times [0,\infty)} (v_d^2 w^{2d} \wedge \ell^d(C)^2) \zeta^2 ds dy \nu^1(w, d\zeta) \nu^2(dw) \\
&< \infty.
\end{aligned}$$

It follows that no single particle will change type more than finitely often by time t .

It is now straightforward to write down an equation for the way in which individuals' types change with time. For $U_j < U_i$, define

$$L_{ij}(t) = \#\{s \leq t : N_{ij}(s) - N_{ij}(s-) = 1, N_{ik}(s) - N_{ik}(s-) = 0 \forall U_k < U_j\}.$$

Then, writing K_i for the type of the individual with level U_i ,

$$K_i(t) = K_i(0) + \sum_{U_j < U_i} \int_0^t (K_j(s-) - K_i(s-)) dL_{ij}(s). \quad (4.21)$$

As in Section 5 of [5], the genealogy of the particles alive at time t is determined by the L_{ij} . In particular, the index of the ancestor at time $r < t$ of the particle at level U_i at time t satisfies

$$J_i(r) = i - \sum_{U_k < U_i \leq U_j} \int_r^t (l \mathbf{1}_{\{J_i(s)=l\}} - k) dL_{lk}(s).$$

Since the lookdown construction for the discrete population model is simply the restriction of the lookdown construction of the infinite density population model, the genealogies of the discrete model converge to those of the infinite density model.

4.1.2 Second construction of spatial Λ -Fleming-Viot with levels

The particle dynamics for $A_{dr,2}^\lambda$ given by (4.20) and (4.21) are very different from the particle dynamics that are natural for $A_{db,th}^\lambda$ defined in (4.15). The event measures $dy \nu^1(w, d\zeta) \nu^2(dw)$ are the same, but what happens at each event $z = (y, \zeta, w)$ is very different. In particular, for a birth/death event in the ball $D_{y,w}$, the total population size in $D_{y,w}$ does not change for $A_{dr,2}^\lambda$, but typically it will change for $A_{db,th}^\lambda$.

For $A_{db,th}^\lambda$, each particle will have a birth time b_i (which we will take to be 0 for the particles in the population at time 0), an initial location $x_i = X_i(b_i)$, an initial level $u_i = U_i(b_i)$, and a type κ_i which does not change with time.

Let $\mathcal{N} = \mathcal{N}(\mathbb{R}^d \times [0, \infty))$ be the space of counting measures on $\mathbb{R}^d \times [0, \infty)$. The evolution of the process is determined by a Poisson random measure ξ on $[0, \infty) \times \mathcal{N} \times \mathbb{R}^d \times [0, 1] \times [0, \infty)$ with mean measure

$$ds\nu^3(y, \zeta, w, d\gamma)dy\nu^1(w, d\zeta)\nu^2(dw),$$

where $\nu^3(y, \zeta, w, d\gamma)$ is the distribution of the Poisson random measure on $\mathbb{R}^d \times [0, \infty)$ with mean measure

$$\frac{\zeta}{1-\zeta}\mathbf{1}_{D_{y,w}}(y')dy'dv = \frac{\zeta}{1-\zeta}|D_{y,w}|v_{y,w}(dy')dv.$$

Note that a “point” in ξ is of the form $\psi = (s', \{(y'_k, v_k), k \geq 1\}, y, \zeta, w)$, where we will assume that the $\{(y'_k, v_k)\}$ are indexed in increasing order of the v_k . In constructing the particle representation, instead of describing the parent in a birth/death event ψ as being eliminated, we will assume that the location and level of the parental particle jump to $(y'_1, \frac{1}{1-\zeta}v_1)$. Then, the birth times, locations, and levels of “new” particles are given by

$$\mathcal{B} = \cup_{\psi \in \xi} \{(s', y'_k, \frac{1}{1-\zeta}v_k), k \geq 2, v_k < (1-\zeta)\lambda\}.$$

Define $v^*(\psi) = v_1$ and $y^*(\psi) = y'_1$, and take $(x^*(\psi, \eta), \kappa^*(\psi, \eta), u^*(\psi, \eta)) = (x^*, \kappa^*, u^*)$ to be the point in η satisfying $x^* \in D_{y,w}$ and

$$u^* = \operatorname{argmax}\left\{\frac{\lambda - u}{\lambda - v^*} : (x, \kappa, u) \in \eta, x \in D_{y,w}, u \geq v^*\right\} \cup \left\{\frac{u}{v^*} : (x, \kappa, u) \in \eta, x \in D_{y,w}, u \geq v^*\right\}.$$

Let $h_{y,w}^\lambda(x, u, \eta, v^*) = h_r^\lambda(s, u, \lambda, v^*)$ with $r = \mathbf{1}_{D_{y,w}}$, and extend the definition of $h_{y,w}^\lambda$ in (3.3) so that $h_{y,w}^\lambda(x, u^*, \eta, v^*) = v^*$. Set $G_t = [0, t] \times \mathcal{N} \times \mathbb{R}^d \times [0, 1] \times [0, \infty)$. Then, if $(x, \kappa, u) \in \eta(0)$, the location and level evolve by

$$\begin{aligned} X(t) &= x + \int_{G_t} \mathbf{1}_{D_{y,w}}(X(s-))(y^*(\psi) - X(s-))\mathbf{1}_{\{U(s-)=u^*(\psi, \eta(s-))\}}\xi(d\psi) \\ U(t) &= u + \int_{G_t} \mathbf{1}_{D_{y,w}}(X(s-))\left(\frac{h_{y,w}^\lambda(X(s-), U(s-), \eta(s-), v^*(\psi))}{1-\zeta}\right) - U(s-))\xi(d\psi), \end{aligned}$$

and setting $G_{s',t} = (s', t] \times \mathcal{N} \times \mathbb{R}^d \times [0, 1] \times [0, \infty)$, if

$$\psi = (s', \{(y'_k, v_k), k \geq 1\}, y, \zeta, w) \in \xi$$

and $k > 1$, for $t > s'$, the location and level satisfy

$$\begin{aligned} X(t) &= y'_k + \int_{G_{s',t}} \mathbf{1}_{D_{y,w}}(X(s-))(y^*(\psi) - X(s-))\mathbf{1}_{\{U(s-)=u^*(\psi, \eta(s-))\}}\xi(d\psi) \\ U(t) &= \frac{v_k}{1-\zeta} + \int_{G_{s',t}} \mathbf{1}_{D_{y,w}}(X(s-))\left(\frac{h_{y,w}^\lambda(X(s-), U(s-), \eta(s-), v^*(\psi))}{1-\zeta}\right) - U(s-))\xi(d\psi), \end{aligned}$$

and the type is given by $\kappa^*(\psi, \eta(s'-))$.

Passing to the limit as $\lambda \rightarrow \infty$, the equations become

$$\begin{aligned} X(t) &= x + \int_{G_t} \mathbf{1}_{D_{y,w}}(X(s-))(y^*(\psi) - X(s-))\mathbf{1}_{\{U(s-)=u^*(\psi, \eta(s-))\}}\xi(d\psi) \\ U(t) &= u + \int_{G_t} \mathbf{1}_{D_{y,w}}(X(s-))\left(\frac{U(s-) - \mathbf{1}_{\{U(s-) \geq v^*(\psi)\}}(u^*(\psi, \eta(s-)) - v^*(\psi))}{1 - \zeta} - U(s-)\right)\xi(d\psi). \end{aligned}$$

Since the downward jumps in U , when they occur, will typically be $O(1)$, we can only allow finitely many per unit time. Conditional on U , the intensity of downward jumps is

$$\int_0^\infty \int_0^1 v_d w^d (1 - e^{-\frac{\zeta}{1-\zeta} v_d w^d U(t)}) \nu^1(w, d\zeta) \nu^2(dw),$$

which we require to be finite. The cumulative effect of the upward jumps on $\log U$ is bounded by

$$- \int_{G_t} \mathbf{1}_{D_{y,w}}(X(s-)) \log(1 - \zeta) \xi(d\psi)$$

which has expectation

$$- \int_0^t \int_0^\infty \int_0^1 v_d w^d \log(1 - \zeta) \nu^1(w, d\zeta) \nu^2(dw),$$

so the upward jumps will be well-behaved provided

$$\int_0^\infty \int_0^1 v_d w^d \zeta \nu^1(w, d\zeta) \nu^2(dw) < \infty,$$

which is (4.19). Thus, once again, genealogies converge under passage to the infinite intensity limit.

4.2 Spatial Λ -Fleming-Viot process with general offspring distribution

In the discrete birth/independent thinning model described in the previous section, the offspring distribution was Poisson and the model was constructed so that for $\lambda = \infty$, the locations and levels of the particles form a spatial Poisson process that is stationary in time. We now drop the Poisson assumption and allow an offspring distribution restricted only by the requirement that the expected number of offspring for an event $z = (y, \zeta, w)$ in the ball $D_{y,w}$ with thinning probability ζ is

$$\sum_{k=0}^\infty k p(k, z) = \lambda \frac{\zeta}{1 - \zeta} |D_{y,w}|.$$

Writing

$$A_{db,th}^\lambda f(\eta) = \int_{\mathbb{U}} \sum_k p(k, z) (H_{k,z}^\lambda(g, \eta) - f(\eta)) dy \nu^1(w, d\zeta) \nu^2(dw),$$

as before, if $\eta(D_{y,w} \times \mathbb{K}) = 0$, $H_{k,z}^\lambda(g, \eta) = f(\eta)$, and if $\eta(D_{y,w} \times \mathbb{K}) \neq 0$,

$$\begin{aligned} H_{k,z}^\lambda(g, \eta) &= \prod_{(x, \kappa, u) \in \eta, x \notin D_{y,w}} g(x, \kappa, u) \\ &\quad \times \int_0^\lambda \left[\frac{k}{\lambda} \left(1 - \frac{v^*}{\lambda}\right)^{k-1} \widehat{g}_{y,w}(\kappa^*, \frac{1}{1-\zeta} v^*) \left(\frac{1}{\lambda - v^*} \int_{v^*}^\lambda \widehat{g}_{y,w}(\kappa^*, \frac{1}{1-\zeta} v) dv \right)^{k-1} \right. \\ &\quad \left. \times \prod_{(x, \kappa, u) \in \eta, x \in D_{y,w}, u \neq u^*} g(x, \kappa, \frac{1}{1-\zeta} h_{y,w}^\lambda(x, u, \eta, v^*)) \right] dv^* \end{aligned}$$

where (x^*, κ^*, u^*) is the point in η satisfying $x^* \in D_{y,w}$ and

$$u^* = \operatorname{argmax} \left\{ \frac{\lambda - u}{\lambda - v^*} : (x, \kappa, u) \in \eta, x \in D_{y,w}, u \geq v^* \right\} \cup \left\{ \frac{u}{v^*} : (x, \kappa, u) \in \eta, x \in D_{y,w}, u \geq v^* \right\},$$

and $h_{y,w}^\lambda(x, u, \eta, v^*)$ is obtained as in (3.3) with $r = \mathbf{1}_{D_{y,w}}$.

Recalling that $\bar{g}_{y,w}(\kappa) = \lambda^{-1} \int_0^\lambda \int g(x, \kappa, u) v_{y,w}(dx) du$ and averaging, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} \alpha A_{db,th}^\lambda f(\bar{\eta}) &= \alpha f(\bar{\eta}) \int_{\mathbb{U}} \sum_k p(k, z) \frac{1}{|\bar{\eta}|_{D_{y,w}}} \sum_{(x^*, \kappa^*) \in \bar{\eta}|_{D_{y,w}}} \frac{1}{\bar{g}(x^*, \kappa^*)} \prod_{(x, \kappa) \in \bar{\eta}|_{D_{y,w}}, (x, \kappa) \neq (x^*, \kappa^*)} \left((1 - \zeta) + \zeta \frac{1}{\bar{g}(x, \kappa)} \right) \\ &\quad \times (\zeta + (1 - \zeta) \bar{g}_{y,w}(\kappa^*))^k dy \nu^1(w, d\zeta) \nu^2(dw). \end{aligned}$$

To obtain a limit as $\lambda \rightarrow \infty$, for each z , let $\mu(dq, z)$ be a probability distribution on $[0, \infty)$ satisfying

$$\int_0^\infty q \mu(dq, z) = \alpha_z \equiv \frac{\zeta}{1 - \zeta} |D_{y,w}|,$$

and assume that for each $h \in C_b([0, \infty))$,

$$\sum_k h\left(\frac{k}{\lambda}\right) p^\lambda(k, z) \rightarrow \int_0^\infty h(q) \mu(dq, z).$$

These conditions imply

$$\sum_k p^\lambda(k, z) \int_0^\lambda \frac{k}{\lambda} \left(1 - \frac{v^*}{\lambda}\right)^{\lambda \frac{k-1}{\lambda}} f(v^*) dv^* \rightarrow \int_0^\infty \int_0^\infty q e^{-qv^*} f(v^*) dv^* \mu(dq, z).$$

Observing that $\frac{k}{\lambda} \rightarrow q$ implies

$$\begin{aligned} \left(\frac{1}{\lambda - v^*} \int_{v^*}^\lambda \widehat{g}_{y,w}(\kappa^*, \frac{1}{1-\zeta} v) dv \right)^{k-1} &\rightarrow \exp \left\{ -q \int_{v^*}^\infty \left(1 - \widehat{g}_{y,w}(\kappa^*, \frac{1}{1-\zeta} v)\right) dv \right\} \\ &= \exp \left\{ -q(1 - \zeta) \widehat{h}_{y,w}(\kappa^*, v^*) \right\}, \end{aligned}$$

where $\widehat{h}_{y,w}(\kappa, u) = \int_u^\infty (1 - \widehat{g}_{y,w}(\kappa, v)) dv$, it follows that $\sum_k p^\lambda(k, z) H_{k,z}^\lambda(g, \eta)$ converges to

$$\begin{aligned} H_z(g, \eta) &= \prod_{(x, \kappa, u) \in \eta, x \notin D_{y,w}} g(x, \kappa, u) \\ &\times \int_0^\infty \int_0^\infty \left[q e^{-qv^*} \widehat{g}_{y,w}(\kappa^*, \frac{1}{1-\zeta} v^*) \exp\{-q(1-\zeta) \widehat{h}_{y,w}(\kappa^*, v^*)\} \right. \\ &\times \prod_{(x, \kappa, u) \in \eta, x \in D_{y,w}, u > u^*} g(x, \kappa, \frac{1}{1-\zeta} (u - (u^* - v^*))) \\ &\times \left. \prod_{(x, \kappa, u) \in \eta, x \in D_{y,w}, u < u^*} g(x, \kappa, \frac{1}{1-\zeta} u) \right] dv^* \mu(dq, z), \end{aligned}$$

and

$$A_{db,th}^\infty f(\eta) = \int_{\mathbb{U}} (H_z(g, \eta) - f(\eta)) dy \nu^1(w, d\zeta) \nu^2(dw). \quad (4.22)$$

If $\mu(dq, z)$ is degenerate for every z , that is, $\mu(dq, z) = \delta_{\alpha_z}$, then (4.22) is the same as (4.16). Of course, if $\{p^\lambda(k, z)\}$ is the Poisson distribution with mean $\lambda \frac{\zeta}{1-\zeta} |D_{y,w}|$, then degeneracy holds. However, we can also construct non-degenerate examples, for example by choosing a geometric offspring distribution, in which case $\mu(dq, z)$ is exponential. This approach leads to a rich class of models in which we can combine the forces of ecology and genetics.

Let ξ be a Poisson random measure on $[0, \infty) \times [0, \infty) \times \mathbb{R}^d \times [0, 1] \times [0, \infty)$ with mean measure $ds \mu(dq, z) dy \nu^1(w, d\zeta) \nu^2(dw)$. If $\sum_{(x, \kappa, u) \in \eta_0} \delta_{(x, \kappa, u)}$ is conditionally Poisson with Cox measure $\Xi(0, dx, d\kappa) du = P(0, x) \Xi_x(0, d\kappa) dx du$, then $\Xi(t, dx, d\kappa) = P(t, x) \Xi_x(t, d\kappa)$, where P satisfies

$$P(t, x) = P(0, x) + \int_{[0, t] \times [0, \infty) \times \mathbb{R}^d \times [0, 1] \times [0, \infty)} \left(\frac{(1-\zeta)q}{|D_{y,w}|} - \zeta P(s-, x) \right) \mathbf{1}_{D_{y,w}}(x) \xi(ds, dq, dy, d\zeta, dw).$$

Note that in the degenerate case, $P(t, x) \equiv 1$ is a solution of this equation.

As before, setting $h_{y,w}^*(\kappa) = \int_0^\infty (1 - \widehat{g}_{y,w}(\kappa, u)) du$ and

$$\mathbb{H}_3(q, y, \zeta, w, \Xi, h_{y,w}^*) = \frac{1}{\Xi(D_{y,w} \times \mathbb{K})} \int_{D_{y,w} \times \mathbb{K}} e^{-q(1-\zeta) h_{y,w}^*(\kappa)} \Xi(dx \times d\kappa),$$

we have

$$\begin{aligned} \alpha A_{db,th}^\infty f(\Xi) &= e^{-\int h(x, \kappa) \Xi(dx, d\kappa)} \int_{[0, \infty) \times \mathbb{R}^d \times [0, 1] \times [0, \infty)} (\mathbb{H}_3(q, y, \zeta, w, \Xi, h_{y,w}^*) e^{\zeta \int_{D_{y,w} \times \mathbb{K}} h(x, \kappa) \Xi(dx, d\kappa)} - 1) \\ &\times \mu(dq, z) dy \nu^1(w, d\zeta) \nu^2(dw). \end{aligned}$$

4.3 Spatially interacting Moran model

Consider $A_{dr,3}$ in the special case in which the sum is over all subsets with $|S| = 2$, include independent motion with generator B , set $q(x, z, dy) = \delta_x(dy)$, and assume $r(x, x') = r(x', x)$. The generator becomes

$$Af(\eta) = f(\eta) \sum_{(x, u) \in \eta} \frac{Bg(x, u)}{g(x, u)} + f(\eta) \sum_{(x, u) \neq (x', u') \in \eta} r(x, x') \mathbf{1}_{\{u' < u\}} \left(\frac{g(x', u)}{g(x, u)} - 1 \right) \quad (4.23)$$

and

$$\alpha A f(\bar{\eta}) = \alpha f(\bar{\eta}) \sum_{x \in \bar{\eta}} \frac{B \bar{g}(x)}{\bar{g}(x)} + \alpha f(\bar{\eta}) \sum_{\{x, x'\} \subset \bar{\eta}} r(x, x') \left(\frac{1}{2} \frac{\bar{g}(x')}{\bar{g}(x)} + \frac{1}{2} \frac{\bar{g}(x)}{\bar{g}(x')} - 1 \right),$$

that is, at rate $r(x, x')$ one of the pair is killed and replaced by a copy of the other.

If we assume that x involves both a location v and a type w and that $r((v, w), (v', w')) = \gamma \mathbf{1}_{\{v=v'\}}$, then we obtain the lookdown construction of the spatially interacting Moran model considered in [8].

Note that λ does not appear in the formula for the generator (4.23). Consequently, the same formula gives the limiting generator as $\lambda \rightarrow \infty$, and with reference to (A.3),

$$\begin{aligned} \alpha A^\infty f(\Xi) &= e^{-\int_E h(x) \Xi(dx)} \left[- \int_E B h(x) \Xi(dx) \right. \\ &\quad \left. + \int_{E \times E} r(x, x') \left(\frac{1}{2} h^2(x) + \frac{1}{2} h^2(x') - h(x') h(x) \right) \Xi(dx) \Xi(dx') \right]. \end{aligned}$$

From the description of the $\lambda < \infty$ processes, it is clear that mass is preserved. For the limiting process, one can also see that mass is preserved directly from the limiting generator. Suppose Ξ is a solution of the martingale problem with $\Xi(0, E) < \infty$. Take $h(x) \equiv c > 0$, and observe that $e^{-c \Xi(t, E)}$ is a martingale. But if M and M^2 are both martingales, then M must be constant.

If $r(x, x') \equiv \gamma$ and $\Xi(0, E) = 1$, then Ξ is a neutral Fleming-Viot process. Since the set of levels is fixed, in this case, the lookdown construction is equivalent to the construction given in [4]. If as above, $r((v, w), (v', w')) = \gamma \mathbf{1}_{\{v=v'\}}$, then the lookdown construction for $\lambda = \infty$ is just the lookdown construction for the interacting Fisher-Wright diffusions discussed in [8].

4.4 Branching processes

Next, we recover a lookdown construction for the Dawson-Watanabe superprocess. Let $A_{cb,k}$ be given by (3.5), and let $A_{cd,k}$ be the continuous death generator with $d_0(x) = r(x)(k+1)$. Then

$$\begin{aligned} A^\lambda f(\eta) &= \lambda (A_{cb,k} f(\eta) + A_{cd,k} f(\eta)) \\ &= f(\eta) \sum_{(x,u) \in \eta} \lambda r(x) \left[\frac{(k+1)}{\lambda^k} \int_u^\lambda \cdots \int_u^\lambda \left(\prod_{i=1}^k g(x, v_i) - 1 \right) dv_1 \cdots dv_k \right. \\ &\quad \left. + (G_k^\lambda(u) + ku) \frac{\partial_u g(x, u)}{g(x, u)} \right] \\ &\rightarrow f(\eta) \sum_{(x,u) \in \eta} r(x)(k+1)k \left(\int_u^\infty (g(x, v) - 1) dv + \frac{1}{2} u^2 \frac{\partial_u g(x, u)}{g(x, u)} \right) \\ &= A^\infty f(\eta), \end{aligned}$$

and

$$\alpha A^\infty f(\Xi) = e^{-\int_E h(x) \Xi(dx)} \int_E r(x) \frac{k(k+1)}{2} h^2(x) \Xi(dx),$$

which is the generator of a Dawson-Watanabe process.

More generally, one can take

$$\begin{aligned}
A^\lambda f(\eta) &= \lambda(A_{cb,k}f(\eta) + A_{cd,k}f(\eta)) \\
&= f(\eta) \int_{\mathbb{U}} \sum_{(x,u) \in \eta} \lambda r(x, z) \left[\frac{(k(z) + 1)}{\lambda^{k(z)}} \int_u^\lambda \cdots \int_u^\lambda \left(\prod_{i=1}^{k(z)} g(x, v_i) - 1 \right) dv_1 \cdots dv_{k(z)} \right. \\
&\quad \left. + (G_{k(z)}^\lambda(u) + k(z)u) \frac{\partial_u g(x, u)}{g(x, u)} \right] \mu(dz) \\
&\rightarrow f(\eta) \int_{\mathbb{U}} \sum_{(x,u) \in \eta} r(x, z) (k(z) + 1) k(z) \left(\int_u^\infty (g(x, v) - 1) dv + \frac{1}{2} u^2 \frac{\partial_u g(x, u)}{g(x, u)} \right) \mu(dz) \\
&= A^\infty f(\eta),
\end{aligned}$$

This construction is a special case of the results in [12].

4.5 A stochastic partial differential equation

Consider a spatially interacting Moran model with both location $x \in \lambda^{-1}\mathbb{Z}$ and type $\kappa \in \mathbb{K}$. Assume that the particle locations follow a simple symmetric random walk, and for simplicity, assume that the types of the particles do not change. Killing and replacement takes place locally at each site. The generator then becomes

$$\begin{aligned}
Af(\eta) &= f(\eta) \sum_{(x, \kappa, u) \in \eta} \lambda^2 \frac{g(x + \lambda^{-1}, \kappa, u) + g(x - \lambda^{-1}, \kappa, u) - 2g(x, \kappa, u)}{2g(x, u)} \\
&\quad + f(\eta) \sum_{(x, \kappa, u) \neq (x', \kappa', u') \in \eta} \lambda \mathbf{1}_{\{x=x'\}} \mathbf{1}_{\{u' < u\}} \left(\frac{g(x, \kappa', u)}{g(x, \kappa, u)} - 1 \right).
\end{aligned}$$

Assume that $\{(X_u^\lambda(0), \kappa_u(0), u)\}$ determines a conditionally Poisson random measure with Cox measure $\lambda^{-1} \times \ell^\lambda(dx) \times \nu_0(x, d\kappa) \times du$ on $(\lambda^{-1}\mathbb{Z} \times \mathbb{K} \times [0, \lambda])$, where ℓ^λ is counting measure on $\lambda^{-1}\mathbb{Z}$ and ν_0 is a random mapping $\nu_0 : x \in \mathbb{R} \rightarrow \nu_0(x, \cdot) \in \mathcal{P}(\mathbb{K})$. Note that as $\lambda \rightarrow \infty$, the $\{X_u^\lambda - X_u^\lambda(0)\}$ converge to independent standard Brownian motions $\{W_u\}$.

For $u' < u$, let $L_{u'u}^\lambda(t)$ be the number of times by time t that there has been a “lookdown” from u to u' . Then $L_{u'u}^\lambda$ is a counting process with integrated intensity

$$\Lambda_{u'u}^\lambda(t) = \lambda \int_0^t \mathbf{1}_{\{X_u^\lambda(s) = X_{u'}^\lambda(s)\}} ds,$$

and we can write

$$L_{u'u}(t) = Y_{u'u}(\Lambda_{u'u}^\lambda(t)),$$

where the $Y_{u'u}$ are independent unit Poisson processes and are independent of $\{X_{u'u}\}$. To identify the limit of $\Lambda_{u'u}^\lambda$, define $X_{u'u}^\lambda(t) = X_{u'}^\lambda(t) - X_u^\lambda(t)$ and

$$N_{u'u}^\lambda(t) = \#\{s \leq t : X_{u'u}^\lambda(s-) = 0, X_{u'u}^\lambda(s) \neq 0\}.$$

Then $N_{u'u}^\lambda$ is a counting process with intensity $\lambda^2 \mathbf{1}_{\{X_{u'u}^\lambda(t)=0\}}$. Define

$$\tilde{N}_{u'u}^\lambda(t) = N_{u'u}^\lambda(t) - \int_0^t \lambda^2 \mathbf{1}_{\{X_{u'u}^\lambda(s)=0\}} ds.$$

Then

$$\begin{aligned} |X_{u'u}^\lambda(t)| &= |X_{u'u}^\lambda(0)| + \int_0^t \text{sign}(X_{u'u}^\lambda(s-)) dX_{u'u}^\lambda(s) + \frac{1}{\lambda} \tilde{N}_{u'u}^\lambda(t) \\ &\quad + \lambda \int_0^t \mathbf{1}_{\{X_{u'u}^\lambda(s)=0\}} ds. \end{aligned}$$

Since $X_{u'u}^\lambda \Rightarrow X_{u'u} = X_{u'} - X_u$ and $\lambda^{-1} \tilde{N}_{u'u}^\lambda \Rightarrow 0$, $X_{u'u}$ and $\Lambda_{u'u}$ satisfy Tanaka's formula

$$|X_{u'u}(t)| = |X_{u'u}(0)| + \int_0^t \text{sign}(X_{u'u}(s-)) dX_{u'u}(s) + \Lambda_{u'u}(t),$$

where $\Lambda_{u'u}$ is the limit of $\Lambda_{u'u}^\lambda(t) \equiv \lambda \int_0^t \mathbf{1}_{\{X_{u'u}^\lambda(s)=0\}} ds$. An application of Itô's formula gives

$$\Lambda_{u'u}(t) = \lim_{\varepsilon \rightarrow 0} \frac{1}{\varepsilon} \int_0^t \mathbf{1}_{(-\varepsilon, \varepsilon)}(X_{u'}(s) - X_u(s)) ds. \quad (4.24)$$

To summarize, $\{(X_u(0), \kappa_u(0), u)\}$ determines a conditionally Poisson random measure with Cox measure $dx \times \nu_0(x, d\kappa) \times du$. $X_u(t) = X_u(0) + W_u(t)$, where the W_u are independent, standard Brownian motions. $\Lambda_{u'u}$ is given by

$$L_{u'u}(t) = Y_{u'u}(\Lambda_{u'u}(t))$$

where the $Y_{u'u}$ are independent unit Poisson processes that are independent of $\{(X_u(0), \kappa_u, u)\}$ and $\{W_u\}$. The particle types satisfy

$$\kappa_u(t) = \kappa_u(0) + \sum_{u' < u} \int_0^t (\kappa_{u'}(s-) - \kappa_u(s-)) dL_{u'u}(s).$$

Then $\{(X_u(t), \kappa_u(t), u)\}$ determines a conditionally Poisson random measure with Cox measure

$$\Xi_t(dx, d\kappa) \times du = dx \times \nu_t(x, d\kappa) \times du.$$

For details and related results see Buhr [3]. In particular, for $\varphi(x, \kappa)$ bounded, C^2 in x , and having compact support in x ,

$$M_\varphi(t) = \langle \Xi_t, \varphi \rangle - \int_0^t \langle \Xi_s, \frac{1}{2} \partial_x^2 \varphi \rangle ds$$

is a $\{\mathcal{F}_t^\Xi\}$ -martingale with quadratic variation

$$[M_\varphi]_t = \int_0^t \int_{\mathbb{R}} \int_{\mathbb{K} \times \mathbb{K}} (\varphi(x, \kappa') - \varphi(x, \kappa))^2 \nu_s(x, d\kappa') \nu_s(x, d\kappa) dx ds.$$

Suppose $\mathbb{K} = \{0, 1\}$ and $\nu_s(x) \equiv \nu_s(x, \{1\})$. Then taking $\varphi(x, \kappa) = \kappa\psi(x)$,

$$M_\psi(t) = \int_{\mathbb{R}} \psi(x) \nu_s(x) dx - \int_0^t \int_{\mathbb{R}} \frac{1}{2} \psi''(x) \nu_s(x) dx ds$$

is a martingale with quadratic variation

$$[M_\psi]_t = \int_0^t \int_{\mathbb{R}} 2\psi^2(x) \nu_s(x) (1 - \nu_s(x)) dx ds$$

which implies ν_t is a weak solution of the stochastic partial differential equation

$$\begin{aligned} \int_{\mathbb{R}} \psi(x) \nu_t(x) dx &= \int_{\mathbb{R}} \psi(x) \nu_0(x) dx + \int_0^t \int_{\mathbb{R}} \frac{1}{2} \psi''(x) \nu_s(x) dx ds \\ &\quad + \int_{[0,t] \times \mathbb{R}} \psi(x) \sqrt{2\nu_s(x)(1 - \nu_s(x))} W(ds, dx), \end{aligned} \quad (4.25)$$

where W is Gaussian white noise on $[0, \infty) \times \mathbb{R}$ with $E[W(A)W(B)] = \ell(A \cap B)$ for Lebesgue measure ℓ on $[0, \infty) \times \mathbb{R}$.

4.6 Voter model

The stochastic partial differential equation (4.25) is a special case of the equation that arises as the limit of rescaled voter models in the work of Mueller and Tribe [14]. To see the relationship of their work to our current approach, we give a construction of a class of voter models.

Let $E = \mathbb{Z} \times \mathbb{K}$, where $\mathbb{Z}$ is the space of locations and $\mathbb{K}$ the space of types. We assume that there is one particle at each location, and consider

$$A_{dr,3}f(\eta) = f(\eta) \sum_{i \neq j} r(|x_i - x_j|) \mathbf{1}_{\{u_i < u_j\}} \left(\frac{g(x_i, \kappa_i, u_i)g(x_j, \kappa_j, u_j) + g(x_i, \kappa_i, u_j)g(x_j, \kappa_j, u_i)}{2g(x_i, \kappa_i, u_i)g(x_j, \kappa_j, u_j)} - 1 \right).$$

Then

$$\alpha A_{dr,3}f(\bar{\eta}) = \alpha f(\bar{\eta}) \sum_{i < j} r(|x_i - x_j|) \left(\frac{1}{2} \frac{\bar{g}(x_j, \kappa_j)}{\bar{g}(x_i, \kappa_i)} + \frac{1}{2} \frac{\bar{g}(x_i, \kappa_i)}{\bar{g}(x_j, \kappa_j)} - 1 \right)$$

which is the generator for a voter model. Note that the collection of levels does not change, and the location of the particle associated with level u will satisfy a stochastic equation of the form

$$X_u(t) = X_u(0) + \sum_{k < l} \int_{[0,t] \times \{0,1\}} \theta(\mathbf{1}_{\{X_u(s-) = l\}}(k - l) + \mathbf{1}_{\{X_u(s-) = k\}}(l - k)) \xi_{kl}(ds, d\theta),$$

where the ξ_{kl} are independent Poisson random measures with mean measures $r(|k - l|)(\frac{1}{2}\delta_1(d\theta) + \frac{1}{2}\delta_0(d\theta))ds$. For $k > l$, assume $\xi_{kl} \equiv \xi_{lk}$. Let $U_l(t)$ and $\widehat{K}_l(t)$ denote the level and type of the particle with location l . Then the type for the particle with level u satisfies

$$K_u(t) = K_u(0) + \sum_{l \neq k} \int_{[0,t] \times \{0,1\}} \mathbf{1}_{\{U_l(s-) < u\}} \mathbf{1}_{\{X_u(s-) = k\}} (\widehat{K}_l(s-) - K_u(s-)) \xi_{kl}(ds, d\theta).$$

Now, as $\lambda \rightarrow \infty$, assume that $\{(\lambda^{-1}X_u(0), K_u(0), u)\}$ converges to a conditionally Poisson point process on $\mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{K} \times [0, \infty)$ with Cox measure $dx \times \nu_0(x, d\kappa) \times du$. Set $X_u^\lambda(t) = \frac{1}{\lambda}X_u(\lambda^2 t)$ and $K_u^\lambda(t) = K_u(\lambda^2 t)$. Then X_u^λ is a martingale with quadratic variation

$$[X_u^\lambda]_t = \sum_{k < l} \frac{1}{\lambda^2} \int_{[0, \lambda^2 t] \times \{0, 1\}} \theta(\mathbf{1}_{\{X_u(s-) = l\}}(k - l)^2 + \mathbf{1}_{\{X_u(s-) = k\}}(l - k)^2) \xi_{kl}(ds, d\theta)$$

and

$$[X_u^\lambda]_t \rightarrow \sigma^2 t \equiv \frac{1}{2} \sum_{k < l} (k - l)^2 r(|k - l|) t.$$

In addition, for $u \neq u'$,

$$[X_u^\lambda, X_{u'}^\lambda]_t \rightarrow 0,$$

so the X_u^λ converge to a collection of independent Brownian motions X_u .

For $u' < u$, let

$$N_{u', u}^\lambda(t) = \sum_{l \neq k} \int_{[0, \lambda^2 t] \times \{0, 1\}} \mathbf{1}_{\{X_{u'}(s-) = l\}} \mathbf{1}_{\{X_u(s-) = k\}} \xi_{kl}(ds, d\theta).$$

Then $N_{u', u}^\lambda$ is a counting process with integrated intensity

$$\int_0^t \lambda^2 r(\lambda(X_{u'}^\lambda(s) - X_u^\lambda(s))) ds.$$

Under appropriate scaling conditions, this integral should converge to a constant times the intersection local given in (4.24). Then, up to changes in parameters, the limit of the lookdown construction would be the same as in §4.5.

A Appendix

A.1 Poisson identities

Lemma A.1 *If ξ is a Poisson random measure on S with σ -finite mean measure ν and $f \in L^1(\nu)$, then*

$$E[e^{\int_S f(z) \xi(dz)}] = e^{\int_S (e^f - 1) d\nu}, \quad (\text{A.1})$$

$$E\left[\int_S f(z) \xi(dz)\right] = \int_S f d\nu, \quad \text{Var}\left(\int_S f(z) \xi(dz)\right) = \int_S f^2 d\nu, \quad (\text{A.2})$$

allowing $\infty = \infty$.

Letting $\xi = \sum_i \delta_{Z_i}$, for $g \geq 0$ with $\log g \in L^1(\nu)$,

$$E\left[\prod_i g(Z_i)\right] = e^{\int_S (g - 1) d\nu}.$$

Similarly, if $hg, g - 1 \in L^1(\nu)$, then

$$E\left[\sum_j h(Z_j) \prod_i g(Z_i)\right] = \int_S hg d\nu e^{\int_S (g - 1) d\nu},$$

$$E\left[\sum_{i \neq j} h(Z_i)h(Z_j) \prod_k g(Z_k)\right] = \left(\int_S h g d\nu\right)^2 e^{\int_S (g-1)d\nu},$$

and more generally, if ν has no atoms and $r \in M(S \times S)$, $r \geq 0$,

$$E\left[\sum_{i \neq j} r(Z_i, Z_j) \prod_{k \neq i, j} g(Z_k)\right] = \int_{S \times S} r(x, y) \nu(dx) \nu(dy) e^{\int_S (g-1)d\nu}, \quad (\text{A.3})$$

allowing $\infty = \infty$.

Proof. The independence properties of ξ imply (A.1) for simple functions. The general case follows by approximation.

To prove (A.3), it is enough to consider a finite measure ν and bounded continuous r and g and extend by approximation. Let $\{B_k^n\}$ be a partition of S with $\text{diam}(B_k^n) \leq n^{-1}$, and let $x_k^n \in B_k^n$. Define

$$\xi_n = \sum_k \delta_{x_k^n} \mathbf{1}_{\{\xi(B_k^n) > 0\}}.$$

Then $\xi_n \rightarrow \xi$ in the sense that $\int f d\xi_n \rightarrow \int f d\xi$ for every bounded continuous f , and

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{i \neq j} r(x_i^n, x_j^n) \mathbf{1}_{\{\xi(B_i^n) > 0\}} \mathbf{1}_{\{\xi(B_j^n) > 0\}} \prod_{k \neq i, j} (g(x_k^n) \mathbf{1}_{\{\xi(B_k^n) > 0\}} + \mathbf{1}_{\{\xi(B_k^n) = 0\}}) \\ \rightarrow \sum_{i \neq j} r(Z_i, Z_j) \prod_{k \neq i, j} g(Z_k). \end{aligned}$$

By independence, the expectation of the left side is

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{i \neq j} r(x_i^n, x_j^n) (1 - e^{-\nu(B_i^n)}) (1 - e^{-\nu(B_j^n)}) \prod_{k \neq i, j} (g(x_k^n) (1 - e^{-\nu(B_k^n)}) + e^{-\nu(B_k^n)}) \\ \approx \sum_{i \neq j} r(x_i^n, x_j^n) \nu(B_i^n) \nu(B_j^n) \exp\left\{\sum_{k \neq i, j} (g(x_k^n) - 1) \nu(B_k^n)\right\} \\ \rightarrow \int_{S \times S} r(x, y) \nu(dx) \nu(dy) e^{\int_S (g-1)d\nu}, \end{aligned}$$

where the convergence follows from the assumed continuity of r and g and the fact that $\sum_i \nu(B_i^n)^2 \rightarrow 0$.

The other identities follow in a similar manner. Note that the integrability of the random variables in the expectations above can be verified by replacing g by $(|g| \wedge a) \mathbf{1}_A + \mathbf{1}_{A^c}$ and h by $(|h| \wedge a) \mathbf{1}_A$ for $0 < a < \infty$ and $\nu(A) < \infty$ and passing to the limit as $a \rightarrow \infty$ and $A \nearrow E$. $\square$

A.2 Markov mapping theorem

The following theorem (extending Corollary 3.5 from [9]) plays an essential role in justifying the particle representations and can also be used to prove uniqueness for the corresponding measure-valued processes. Let (S, d) and (S_0, d_0) be complete, separable metric spaces,

$B(S) \subset M(S)$ be the Banach space of bounded measurable functions on S , with $\|f\| = \sup_{x \in S} |f(x)|$, and $C_b(S) \subset B(S)$ be the subspace of bounded continuous functions. An operator $A \subset B(S) \times B(S)$ is *dissipative* if $\|f_1 - f_2 - \epsilon(g_1 - g_2)\| \geq \|f_1 - f_2\|$ for all $(f_1, g_1), (f_2, g_2) \in A$ and $\epsilon > 0$; A is a *pre-generator* if A is dissipative and there are sequences of functions $\mu_n : S \rightarrow \mathcal{P}(S)$ and $\lambda_n : S \rightarrow [0, \infty)$ such that for each $(f, g) \in A$

$$g(x) = \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \lambda_n(x) \int_S (f(y) - f(x)) \mu_n(x, dy) \quad (\text{A.4})$$

for each $x \in S$. A is *countably determined* if there exists a countable subset $\{g_k\} \subset \mathcal{D}(A) \cap \overline{C}(S)$ such that every solution of the martingale problem for $\{(g_k, Ag_k)\}$ is a solution for the martingale problem for A . (For example, A is countably determined if it is *graph separable* in the sense that there exists $\{(g_k, h_k)\} \subset A \cap \overline{C}(S) \times B(S)$ such that A is contained in the bounded pointwise closure of $\{(g_k, h_k)\}$.) These conditions are satisfied by essentially all operators A that might reasonably be thought to be generators of Markov processes. Note that A is graph separable if $A \subset L \times L$, where $L \subset B(S)$ is separable in the sup norm topology, for example, if S is locally compact and L is the space of continuous functions vanishing at infinity.

A collection of functions $D \subset \overline{C}(S)$ is *separating* if $\nu, \mu \in \mathcal{P}(S)$ and $\int_S f d\nu = \int_S f d\mu$ for all $f \in D$ imply $\mu = \nu$.

For an S_0 -valued, measurable process Y , $\widehat{\mathcal{F}}_t^Y$ will denote the completion of the σ -algebra $\sigma(Y(0), \int_0^r h(Y(s)) ds, r \leq t, h \in B(S_0))$. For almost every t , $Y(t)$ will be $\widehat{\mathcal{F}}_t^Y$ -measurable, but in general, $\widehat{\mathcal{F}}_t^Y$ does not contain $\mathcal{F}_t^Y = \sigma(Y(s) : s \leq t)$. Let $\mathbf{T}^Y = \{t : Y(t) \text{ is } \widehat{\mathcal{F}}_t^Y \text{ measurable}\}$. If Y is càdlàg and has no fixed points of discontinuity (that is, for every t , $Y(t) = Y(t-)$ a.s.), then $\mathbf{T}^Y = [0, \infty)$. Let $D_S[0, \infty)$ denote the space of càdlàg, S -valued functions with the Skorohod topology, and $M_S[0, \infty)$ denotes the space of Borel measurable functions, $x : [0, \infty) \rightarrow S$, topologized by convergence in Lebesgue measure.

Theorem A.2 *Let (S, d) and (S_0, d_0) be complete, separable metric spaces. Let $A \subset \overline{C}(S) \times C(S)$ and $\psi \in C(S)$, $\psi \geq 1$. Suppose that for each $f \in \mathcal{D}(A)$ there exists $c_f > 0$ such that*

$$|Af(x)| \leq c_f \psi(x), \quad x \in A, \quad (\text{A.5})$$

and define $A_0 f(x) = Af(x)/\psi(x)$.

Suppose that A_0 is a countably determined pre-generator, and suppose that $\mathcal{D}(A) = \mathcal{D}(A_0)$ is closed under multiplication and is separating. Let $\gamma : S \rightarrow S_0$ be Borel measurable, and let α be a transition function from S_0 into S ($y \in S_0 \rightarrow \alpha(y, \cdot) \in \mathcal{P}(S)$ is Borel measurable) satisfying $\int h \circ \gamma(z) \alpha(y, dz) = h(y)$, $y \in S_0$, $h \in B(S_0)$, that is, $\alpha(y, \gamma^{-1}(y)) = 1$. Assume that $\tilde{\psi}(y) \equiv \int_S \psi(z) \alpha(y, dz) < \infty$ for each $y \in S_0$ and define

$$C = \{(\int_S f(z) \alpha(\cdot, dz), \int_S Af(z) \alpha(\cdot, dz)) : f \in \mathcal{D}(A)\}.$$

Let $\mu_0 \in \mathcal{P}(S_0)$, and define $\nu_0 = \int \alpha(y, \cdot) \mu_0(dy)$.

- a) If $\tilde{Y}$ satisfies $\int_0^t E[\tilde{\psi}(\tilde{Y}(s))] ds < \infty$ for all $t \geq 0$ and $\tilde{Y}$ is a solution of the martingale problem for (C, μ_0) , then there exists a solution X of the martingale problem for (A, ν_0) such that $\tilde{Y}$ has the same distribution on $M_{S_0}[0, \infty)$ as $Y = \gamma \circ X$. If Y and $\tilde{Y}$ are càdlàg, then Y and $\tilde{Y}$ have the same distribution on $D_{S_0}[0, \infty)$.

b) For $t \in \mathbf{T}^Y$,

$$P\{X(t) \in \Gamma | \widehat{\mathcal{F}}_t^Y\} = \alpha(Y(t), \Gamma), \quad \Gamma \in \mathcal{B}(S). \quad (\text{A.6})$$

- c) If, in addition, uniqueness holds for the martingale problem for (A, ν_0) , then uniqueness holds for the $M_{S_0}[0, \infty)$ -martingale problem for (C, μ_0) . If $\tilde{Y}$ has sample paths in $D_{S_0}[0, \infty)$, then uniqueness holds for the $D_{S_0}[0, \infty)$ -martingale problem for (C, μ_0) .
- d) If uniqueness holds for the martingale problem for (A, ν_0) , then Y restricted to $\mathbf{T}^Y$ is a Markov process.

Remark A.3 Theorem A.2 can be extended to cover a large class of generators whose range contains discontinuous functions. (See [9], Corollary 3.5 and Theorem 2.7.) In particular, suppose $A_1, \dots, A_m$ satisfy the conditions of Theorem A.2 for a common domain $\mathcal{D} = \mathcal{D}(A_1) = \dots = \mathcal{D}(A_m)$ and $\beta_1, \dots, \beta_m$ are nonnegative functions in $B(S)$. Then the conclusions of Theorem A.2 hold for

$$Af = \beta_1 A_1 f + \dots + \beta_m A_m f.$$

Proof. Theorem 3.2 of [9] can be extended to operators satisfying (A.5) by applying Corollary 1.12 of [13] (with the operator B in that corollary set equal zero) in place of Theorem 2.6 of [9]. Alternatively, see Corollary 3.2 of [11] $\square$

References

- [1] N. H. Barton, A. M. Etheridge, and A. Véber. A new model for evolution in a spatial continuum. *Electron. J. Probab.*, 15:no. 7, 162–216, 2010. ISSN 1083-6489. doi: 10.1214/EJP.v15-741. URL <http://dx.doi.org/10.1214/EJP.v15-741>.
- [2] N. Berestycki, A. M. Etheridge, and M. Hutzenthaler. Survival, extinction and ergodicity in a spatially continuous population model. *Markov Process. Related Fields*, 15(3): 265–288, 2009. ISSN 1024-2953.
- [3] Kevin Andrew Buhr. *Spatial Moran models with local interactions*. ProQuest LLC, Ann Arbor, MI, 2002. ISBN 978-0493-63965-9. URL http://gateway.proquest.com/openurl?url_ver=Z39.88-2004&rft_val_fmt=info:ofi/fmt:kev:mt Thesis (Ph.D.)—The University of Wisconsin - Madison.
- [4] Peter Donnelly and Thomas G. Kurtz. A countable representation of the Fleming-Viot measure-valued diffusion. *Ann. Probab.*, 24(2):698–742, 1996. ISSN 0091-1798.
- [5] Peter Donnelly and Thomas G. Kurtz. Particle representations for measure-valued population models. *Ann. Probab.*, 27(1):166–205, 1999. ISSN 0091-1798.
- [6] Peter Donnelly, Steven N. Evans, Klaus Fleischmann, Thomas G. Kurtz, and Xiaowen Zhou. Continuum-sites stepping-stone models, coalescing exchangeable partitions and random trees. *Ann. Probab.*, 28(3):1063–1110, 2000. ISSN 0091-1798. doi: 10.1214/aop/1019160326. URL <http://dx.doi.org/10.1214/aop/1019160326>.

- [7] A M Etheridge. Drift, draft and structure: some mathematical models of evolution. *Banach Center Publ.*, 80:121–144, 2008.
- [8] Andreas Greven, Vlada Limic, and Anita Winter. Representation theorems for interacting Moran models, interacting Fisher-Wright diffusions and applications. *Electron. J. Probab.*, 10:no. 39, 1286–1356 (electronic), 2005. ISSN 1083-6489. URL <http://www.math.washington.edu/~ejpecp/EjpVol10/paper39.abs.html>.
- [9] Thomas G. Kurtz. Martingale problems for conditional distributions of Markov processes. *Electron. J. Probab.*, 3:no. 9, 29 pp. (electronic), 1998. ISSN 1083-6489.
- [10] Thomas G. Kurtz. Particle representations for measure-valued population processes with spatially varying birth rates. In *Stochastic models (Ottawa, ON, 1998)*, volume 26 of *CMS Conf. Proc.*, pages 299–317. Amer. Math. Soc., Providence, RI, 2000.
- [11] Thomas G. Kurtz and Giovanna Nappo. The filtered martingale problem. In *The Oxford handbook of nonlinear filtering*, pages 129–165. Oxford Univ. Press, Oxford, 2011.
- [12] Thomas G. Kurtz and Eliane R. Rodrigues. Poisson representations of branching markov and measure-valued branching processes. *Ann. Probab.*, 39(3):939–984, 2011. doi: 10.1214/10-AOP574. URL <http://dx.doi.org/10.1214/10-AOP574>.
- [13] Thomas G. Kurtz and Richard H. Stockbridge. Stationary solutions and forward equations for controlled and singular martingale problems. *Electron. J. Probab.*, 6:no. 17, 52 pp. (electronic), 2001. ISSN 1083-6489.
- [14] C. Müller and R. Tribe. Stochastic p.d.e.’s arising from the long range contact and long range voter processes. *Probab. Theory Related Fields*, 102(4):519–545, 1995. ISSN 0178-8051. doi: 10.1007/BF01198848. URL <http://dx.doi.org/10.1007/BF01198848>.
- [15] Jesse Taylor. The genealogical consequences of fecundity variance polymorphism. *Genetics*, 182:813–837, 2009.
- [16] Amandine Veber and Anton Wakolbinger. The spatial Lambda-Fleming-Viot process; an event-based construction and a lookdown representation. To Appear in *Ann. Inst. H. Poincaré Probab. Stat.*, 2013.